COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, October 24, 2024

The Council met at 9:49 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

In accordance with Rule 11.1 of the City of Winnipeg Procedure By-law No. 50/2007, the Speaker acknowledged that we are in Treaty One Territory, the home and traditional lands of the Anishinaabe (Ojibwe), Ininew (Cree), and Dakota peoples, and in the National Homeland of the Red River Métis. Our drinking water comes from Shoal Lake 40 First Nation, in Treaty Three Territory.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Orlikow.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'd like to introduce our page for today, Koeun Lee, from École Secondaire Oak Park High School. She resides in the Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood Ward. Thank you for joining Council and for your service today. We'll move in to morning announcements, Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker and good morning to everyone, through you. Just a couple of announcements today. First of all, related to the Winnipeg 150 celebrations. Earlier in October we announced the recipients of the Winnipeg 150 medals which recognize residents for their contributions to our city. I want to thank and congratulate all of…all the councillors here who nominated individuals, who held ceremonies to recognize these outstanding Winnipeggers who continue to do what they do to make our city great. So, over the past couple of weeks there have been ceremonies across the city to hand out the 150 medals and to plant a tree in each recipient's honour. I had the ceremony this past Saturday at the Mayor's Grove in Assiniboine Park to recognize 30 outstanding Winnipeggers. And really, as I said, it's these recipients that make Winnipeg such a special place. People who give their time, their energy to build a better future for us all. And I…of course, a list of all of the 150 recipients is online for all to see. Probably Councillors have the same experience I had, that when the individuals are being called forward and their short bio was being read and it was announced that, you know, highlighted in the contributions that they have made to our city. It made me feel very, very optimistic about our city because there's so many people doing outstanding work. So, congratulations to all who have been recognized. I also want to take this opportunity to once again thank everyone who joined me and others at the RBC Convention Centre on October 5th for the 150 Mayor's Ball. It was just a fantastic evening of the performing arts giving small performances, short performances, highlighting their outstanding abilities and talents. The Royal Winnipeg Ballet, the Manitoba Opera, the Royal Manitoba Theatre Centre and the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra. And so, thank you, again, to everybody who was at that event. Two final announcements. First of all, I want to congratulate President David Chartrand and the members of the Manitoba Métis Federation who had their…who held their annual general assembly just last week. It was held at the Assiniboia Downs. And there was 4,000 people as part of that assembly, which is quite remarkable. That community…that membership continues to grow with the MMF. So, I wanted to congratulate them as well. And then, finally, I know my other Council colleagues are going to mention this as well. I want to acknowledge the fact that member of Parliament, Dan Vandal, who is certainly no stranger to this chamber, spent many years as a City Councillor, has announced he will not be seeking re-election. There will be time later on, as well, to kind of expand on this. But I just want to congratulate and thank Mr. Vandal for his service to the people of Winnipeg at various elected…in various elected positions. And certainly, you know, now as a Minister of the Federal Government, I think he's always been receptive, always been attentive to the needs of Winnipeg. Will always take my call. We've had many good meetings. And in fact, we have a breakfast coming up in the not too distant future, as well. So, thank you and congratulations to Member of Parliament Vandal.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Allard, your morning announcement.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker. Similar to the last speaker, I also have…know probably a few people who will be speaking to this, so I will turn to French.

Translation of French Spoken: 5:52 – 7:34

So, Madam Speaker, I would like to share with everyone in the chamber and the public a thank you to the Honourable Dan Vandal, Minister Vandal. Who, as we know, was a city councillor before his…before his term here. He was a mayoral candidate of Winnipeg and I often ask myself what Winnipeg would be like if it would have been Dan Vandal who had been elected mayor instead who was elected in his place. For me, Dan was my boss. He was a mentor. And he had a very large public life of about 30 years. So, it's a lot of time to serve the public. And in particular, I believe that we all know what a big sacrifice it is to be a federal minister because we leave a lot of time…or we pass a lot of time in Ottawa. And so, it's difficult to go without your family, with our (inaudible), with our community. So, I want to thank Dan for all that he has done. I always maintain, Madam Speaker, Council, and members of the public, that Dan was always, or up until now, the incredible mayor that I never got. He encouraged me to move forward in my career and my professional development. So, with that, Madam Speaker, I would like to give thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Next is Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. And to the comments of the previous two speakers, I wanted to say a few words as well in praise of MP Dan Vandal and former City Councillor. Who…the federal riding is called St. Boniface-St. Vital. So, I think all of Councillor Allard's ward is in it and roughly 85 to 90 percent of my ward is in there, as well. So, it isn't…it's really both the St. Vital and St. Boniface Wards that are…that Dan has represented. I won't go on at length. Many fond memories of working with Dan in his current role and here. I remember asking Dan a question in French here and him responding in French and that was the first time, I think, that had ever happened in this chamber. And we've actually, I think, come a long way, partly due to Dan's leadership and Councillor Allard's leadership, in expanding French language services in this chamber and in the city. I was talking to Councillor Allard last night and Councillor Allard said, well, I view Dan as my mentor. And I said, well, I view Dan as my mentor. And I thought, that's pretty high praise. Really, when you think about it, that's pretty high praise for anybody. So, I will leave it at that for today. And you know, to go through the photos of years and all sorts of different announcements I have done with Dan, it really has been…it's been a pleasure to work with Dan. And Councillor Allard and I have also agreed…very good idea by Councillor Allard, there was a different building I would like to have named for Dan, but Councillor Allard had a better idea, which was to name the Bonivital Pool because it's both…it's right by the boundary, it's Boni and Vital. So, I think that's a great suggestion from Councillor Allard. Councillor…then Councillor Vandal then had a lot to do with getting the library in there to sort of consolidate that little area. So, we won't be pursuing that today, which we thought about given that…given that Dan is still a sitting MP and will be for the remainder of this term. So, the intent is to come back in next year at some point and move to rename the library…sorry, move to rename the pool, the Bonivital Pool, which hopefully will be re-opening sometime there after its renovations and hopefully will serve the residents of St. Boniface and St. Vital with the name Dan Vandal or…Piscine Vandal Pool for some decades to come. So, again, we just wanted to thank our former colleague here and wish him well in retirement. And we will be back next year with a motion to rename the pool.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thanks, Madam Speaker. Sorry, I didn't give you a heads up. I didn't realize we would be, in a way, honouring the former Councillor Dan Vandal. But I had to rise, Madam Speaker, because back in the early '90s, I was heavily involved in advocating for accessibility. And in 1995, when Dan Vandal won his first city election in the ward of St. Boniface, as we worked together, he chaired the Access Advisory Committee for a time. And as we worked through that kind of thing, Madam Speaker, he took me aside after a meeting one day of Access Advisory Committee, and he said, Ross, you sound like a politician. You should consider running for City Council. That was in 1996, I guess it was. Just after…after the election in '95. And I took him seriously. He felt that I should do a thing. And it wasn't until 1998 when I did run, Madam Speaker, taking his advice. And when I did get to Council, I did support him, Madam Speaker. I thought he would have made a great mayor. The problem was he got tagged with the million-dollar toilet, which was kind of too bad. But Madam Speaker, he was worthy of mayor and didn't succeed. But what I would finally just point out and his service to the city, his service to the province and to the…and to the country, is stellar. Like I said, he was first elected in politics in 1995. And I know he moved to the Federal because he was frustrated at the City level. There's never enough money, Madam Speaker, so he thought he could do something at the Federal level regards. But in 2010, I came on my first term. And so, I did serve on Council with him for four years. And he did give me guidance in the background and…because he had so much experience. And he…he actually nicknamed me 'Rocking Roscoe' in my first term because I was stirring things up, Madam Speaker. And I just…I guess I'll finally leave it. Just to give you an idea of how he was a person of the people, I never heard...I heard this word used many times in the past. But the famous speech that he did, and he called a particular thing a gimmick. And I thought, wow, that's very interesting. But that kind of language reflects that he is one of the people and he seriously tried to represent all the people that fell in his area and Canadians. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie.

MINUTES

Councillor Mayes moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on September 26th, 2024, be taken as read and confirmed.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We'll move into delegations. First up is Kelly Ryback. He's in…here in person in support of Item 4 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 16th, regarding the Living Wage Framework. And the Executive Policy Committee notice of Motions 1 and 2. Welcome.

Kelly Ryback: Good morning, Council. Good morning, Clerks. The Living Wage, I do support the EPC recommendation to take as…as read, but not to take action on it, just to receive as information. I first appeared on this on February 22nd, identifying that the City had one of the richest benefits programs that many of the people earning less than 19.21 an hour. The living wage discussion does not apply to them. Thirdly, and most importantly, there was not a dollar amount tagged to this initiative. And as we are now eight months later, there is still not a dollar amount tagged to this. And there's not a revenue stream tagged to this to pay for it. And I will expand on those further. Thirdly is that, there is already a clause in the collective agreement to allow for wage adjustment with one million dollars and that has not moved forward. My concern is that, that's being used as a bargaining chip that they are not moving beyond…less than 19.21. And it's holding things up for the employees to receive more money because they could be stuck on 19.21. And we've also learned last week at EPC that 311 initiatives to improve service and improve working conditions is being held up for that same reason, that employees could have received more money if those negotiations had gone further if they weren't stuck on 19.21. And it is also a concern that I addressed in February 22nd…22nd, is that the numbers provided in a submission were 963 dollars more than what the superintendent of bankruptcy deems as necessary income and monthly expenses. So, I suggest…my request, Madam Speaker, is that, yes, we receive it as information, but no action taken for all those reasons. Secondly, it's not enforceable, it's not accountable when you look to extend that to contractors and subcontractors. You don't know how much they pay them, you don't know if they will pay them, you don't know if the money is received. Secondly on that aspect, your contracts are going to go up in price. And the biggest factor in high cost of living is taxation. So, part C of that is, that you would require the minimum…the living wage on all funded organizations. We just heard last month that the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres requested more funding in their three year plan just because of minimum wage going up. And as minimum wage went up, they had to decrease the amount of funding for janitorial services from 28 community clubs to 19. This takes that further. When you increase the requirement for them to pay 22 percent, and that's just one of their cost items. The grant intake program you reinstated 2.1 million dollars, and they would be required to pay the living wage. So, they are either going to need more than what is allotted for the grant intake program or if they do not receive additional funding, then front-line services to those in need are going to be reduced. So, to increase the wages of X number of people, thousands of their clients of those people in need will receive less services. I am on the board of the St. James-Assiniboine Pioneer Association that oversees the operations of Grant's Old Mill. If we are to…required to pay a living wage, then I would be coming to Council for an additional 4,500 dollars per year to cover that expense and that is only for three employees over 17 weeks. So, how many organizations, community clubs, parks, museums, funded organizations would require additional funding in order to meet the requirement of the living wage? Going back again, you still do not have the entire information in order to make an informed decision. So, therefore, I do support receive as information, but do not take action. Notice of Motion 1 – Remote Work Arrangements. That…this is to everybody from work from home return back to the office. I support this. My employer in 1995 implemented work from home and we closed our downtown office and opened a much smaller office in the suburbs. We had performance metrics, sales…sales quota and customer satisfaction. As identified earlier this year, multiple times, the City of Winnipeg does not have a proper workforce management structure and therefore, you can have employees unsupervised working from home. In fact, former CAO Michael stated, when talking about work from home, that he's told the front-line leaders there is more to supervision than ensuring that somebody's chained to their desk. You do not have the performance criteria, the goals, the supervision in order to have proper work from home situations. Bring them back. Get those in place, then identify who the high achievers are because it is not a right to work from home. It's not in the collective agreement. But make sure that those who are working from home are producing. You do not have that today. Motion 2. This is rich. This is free parking and availability of refreshments for citizens when they come to committee meetings because of long meetings. Though the issue of long meetings is far greater than providing free parking and refreshments. But however, specific to free parking, I would love that. The parking on King Street is the most expensive metered parking in the city. And that is unfair to anybody that has to come and do city business; pay for their taxes or utilities, but also to appear here. And it's limited to two hours. You have the choice to go to Impark at four dollars an hour. But why on King Street is the most expensive

metered parking there? When we're trying…when you're trying to foster engagement. With respect to refreshments, in the gallery, we are not allowed food and refreshments. There's nowhere to go within the building to acquire something when you are here for several hours and there's going to be some time before you can appear, or you're involved in a meeting. Ironically, Councillor and Mayor can have food and beverage at their desk. There's free food and beverage behind this wall. Executive assistants have delivered beverages to Mayor and Council. Councillors as delegates being at this podium with this light have appeared with a coffee mug in hand, completely disrespectful to every single person who appears in this gallery. And I hope that there's changes to rules, but also, for the length of meetings, you want to address the problem? Today's meeting, 20 minutes late. I have been here, you know, likely over 60 times. Every single time, Madam Speaker, meetings do not start on time. And we talk about workforce management and performance. Secondly, these are drawn out because I look at the agenda, I'm number two, two hours of parking should be fine. No, suspension of rules, three councillors can appear before me. This is another problem. Third problem, the unnecessary debate that goes on between members and delegates. If you disagree with a delegate, as long as they are not being disrespectful, address the debate for when you're in deliberation with the Public Service or when you are going to vote and you can make your comments. It's the same thing with Assiniboia School Division, it's very clear: trustees cannot debate a delegate. They can ask questions for clarification. And we have seen Councillors…especially when a Councillor is a delegate, those debates extend for 30 to 40 minutes on one delegate and the Chair allowed it to happen. Yes, free parking would be fantastic. It will foster engagement and give us a break. One case between Councillor and Councillor delegate, I ended up getting a parking ticket because there was a ridiculous conversation for 45 minutes. You want to improve things, you want to improve engagement, address those, allow us to have beverages in the gallery and please put vending machines in so that we can at least acquire something in order to because you get all of that for free discretion, Madam Speaker. Thank you very much. Those are my points.

Councillor Allard: I object to…

Madam Speaker: The delegation is concluded.

Councillor Allard: I object to the speech here being characterized as ridiculous. We are entitled to debate on behalf of the residents.

Madam Speaker: Kelly Ryback, thank you. We have another delegation on the same item. I'll ask you to stand down on the bench and we'll call you forward in a few…few moments. Just before that, there is a suspension of the rules request to hear an additional delegate. Councillor Mayes, that was Curt Hull, I believe you had sent me?

Councillor Mayes: Yes, Mr. Hull thought he had registered. There appeared to be some static in the wires there and we haven't got him on. So, he wanted to present and had a submission, thank you, a report…submission of some sort.

Madam Speaker: Do you require suspension of the rules?

Councillor Mayes: That would be what I require.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I'll call for suspension of the rules to hear one additional delegate. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And so, it's Curt Hull in support of the Notice of Motion 1 under the Water and Waste and Environment Committee regarding Retrofit Investments. And it's also to allow a written submission to Council. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Councillor Mayes: Some of the submissions that are on the agenda, perhaps we can come to this later, there…certainly, there are three under Item 1 on Water and Waste. And the content clearly refers to the Notice of Motion item that's also, unfortunately, number one. Perhaps we can navigate that.

Madam Speaker: Yes, when we get to the item, we will clarify. Thank you. Next, I'd like to call forward Niall Harney, also in support of the same item the delegate just spoke about – the Living Wage Framework. We'll have five minutes on the clock. And the delegate is here with us in person. Welcome.

Niall Harney: Hi. I'd like to clarify that I believe I am actually speaking in…against the motion, which is to receive it as information. That was a confusion on my part. Good morning, Councillors, Mayor. My name is Niall, Niall Harney, I am a researcher at the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. I'm going to keep my comments brief because I believe this is the fourth or fifth time I am here speaking on this motion, this issue. And I apologize to the members of EPC who heard me speak last week. I'm going to repeat myself on a couple of points, but I will try to keep it as brief as possible. The CTPA Manitoba has been playing a role in developing the Canadian Living Wage Framework alongside other offices since 2009, and similar living wage calculations have been adopted across North America and in the United Kingdom. It's important as we have this debate to just remind ourselves what the living wage really is. It's based on a bare-bones budget for two

working parents and two young children to avoid living in poverty. The living wage doesn't provide sufficient income to cover loan or debt repayment, save for retirement, for a home or for other holiday expenses. And at its core, the living wage is based on this principle: that a family with two working parents working full-time should not be living in poverty. So, by ensuring that all employees of the City of Winnipeg earn a living wage, Winnipeg would be joining over 1,300 employers across Canada who have registered as living wage employers since 2007. This includes 400 in British Columbia, over 850 in Ontario, over 700…or sorry, over 75 in Alberta. Further, Winnipeg would be joining 16 municipalities who have already committed to living…to be living wage employers including the cities of Saanich, Burnaby, Pitt Meadows, North Vancouver, Quesnel, BC, Cambridge, Kingston, Waterloo and St. Catherine's. In analysis presented to EPC on July 9th, a high estimate of implementing the living wage was provided to EPC members. Pegging the number at 3.5 million…or sorry, three million dollars, including 1.5 million for City staff and another 1.6 for external contractors. When looking further into that report factoring in existing benefits programs for City of Winnipeg staff, the number that needs to be achieved to provide a living wage for City of Winnipeg employees is actually closer to 17.87 per hour. And when we look further down that analysis, the cost of implementing a living wage at the City of Winnipeg becomes closer to about two million dollars. Now, we all know that the City of Winnipeg faces financial pressures and this Council has done good work to address some of those issues. But what we're talking about here is an amount that is less than 0.1 percent of the City's budget. Implementing a living wage at the City is not going to break the bank. Further, implementing a living wage at the City of Winnipeg is an opportunity to ensure that no worker at the City is living in poverty and to lead by example in eliminating in-work poverty in our city. Thank you for your time and your consideration.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll have both the delegations come forward. Are there any questions? Councillor Schreyer. I'll just ask the delegations to come forward to the podium, please.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Kelly, that would include you. Kelly Ryback, if he's still here.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. And thank you for Kelly Ryback and Niall Harney for being here today. I am not sure I can address it to both. The reality is, Madam Speaker, that within our lifetime, for most of us here, has been the case back in the day, in our lifetime, not that long ago, when the lowest wage earners that worked for the City of Winnipeg made more money compared to the cost of living. And they were actually a higher proportion of the city budget. Since then, we have raised every tax, fine, fee, levy and rate. We have spent our reserves and we are going further into debt when it comes to construction contracts, Madam Speaker. Are we just saying, some way, shape or form that's due to the lowest paid wage earners that work for the City of Winnipeg?

Madam Speaker: Who would like to reply?

Niall Harney: Sorry, could you repeat your question?

Councillor Schreyer: Sure, well I think…I think Niall knows where I'm coming from. I mean, it's pretty consistent with him. My point being, that the lowest paid wage earners for the City of Winnipeg are a smaller and smaller proportion of the City's budget. Sure, certain costs…a lot of costs have gone up at a way higher rate.

Madam Speaker: The question, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: In what way are we implying that it's due to the City's lowest paid wage earners; our debt problem, our tax increase problem. They…our wage earners, lowest paid wage earners, their increases in our lifetime haven't gone up at the same rate as the City's budget, as our City's tax increases. In what way is it due to the lowest paid wage earners that work for the City of Winnipeg? Oh, I know our costs go up. Salaries go up. Construction costs go up.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the question.

Councillor Schreyer: In what way is it due to the lowest paid wage earners? In what way?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Niall Harney: I would say that, across our society, the wages for the lowest paid workers have not kept pace with the cost of living. This is a trend we've seen for last 30 years and the City of Winnipeg has not been able to…or has…is not removed from this trend. What I would say in my presentation is, what we are talking about here is a cost to provide…to ensure that no worker at the City of Winnipeg is living in poverty of less than 0.1 percent of the city's overall budget. This is an amount that is well within our means that is possible for the City to bear and that would provide an example across the city that we need to be paying workers the cost of what it takes to survive.

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

Councillor Schreyer: I wouldn't mind an excerpt from Kelly Ryback, as well. The question, really, was for Kelly.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Are you coming forward, Kelly? Go ahead.

Kelly Ryback: What…Madam Speaker, what Councillor Schreyer describes is world-wide. Every job, every private enterprise, government enterprise. When I entered the workforce at minimum wage, it was three dollars an hour, today it's 15.80. I had, you know, more disposable income 20 years ago than I have today, and I was a high earner. It's all applicable. The lowest minimum wage…the lowest paid jobs in the City is a fraction of the City budget. My first point being that to extend it to contractors, subcontractors, and to all funded organizations is where the biggest problem is. The second one is, not every job description, not every employee falls under the discussion of the living wage. And here's a very…one example being the back shop employee at a golf course. At a private course or a privately operated golf course, that person is making minimum wage. You are saying, under this item, that that back-shop employee at a City-operated golf course, City-owned and operated golf course, should be making 19.21. That is a 22% increase for the same job. There's nothing in the City Charter that says you have to be the highest paid payer of any kind of job compared to private enterprise. Yet, at the higher end of the scale, the biggest pay with biggest benefits is the City of Winnipeg. And that in of itself needs to be addressed. Another item that needs to be addressed is, just yesterday, announced seeking a consultant to hire a CAO with a yes first. And there's an argument on this topic that, geez, if you paid more, you would get more. You would get more productivity, you would get better performance if you paid more. That is a culture that needs to be eradicated. That people should have pride in their work, regardless of pay, and if anybody's slacking off because they just don't like what they're paying…being paid, then that needs to be addressed. That there's…to use that as an argument is not valid. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Yeah, Madam Speaker. So, we've raised every tax, fee, fine, levy and rate. We pay a higher proportion of taxes in proportion to our income as Winnipeggers than ever before. We're still…we've still…we've still reduced services.

Madam Speaker: The question, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Well, Madam Speaker, you can't solve a problem you can't explain. And Madam Speaker, have our delegates here been explained, been shown, by the City of Winnipeg where our inflation rates have gone up, where our costs went up specifically because it looks like we are trying to find an excuse. Oh, let's just…it's an easy target. The lowest wage…the lowest wage earners are an easy target when they are not the problem, Madam Speaker. Have the…they have…can we say to people that we have explained to people where our increases went up?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The question was asked. There's no…

Councillor Schreyer: Can our delegates say that we've explained to the city of Winnipeg, to the people of Winnipeg, where our…where our increases are? Where our budget increases are and where specifically they went? Construction inflation is a larger inflation rate than police pensions, as an example. Have we been explained how that is the case?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Do you wish to answer? We do have other questions. Okay. Next question, Councillor Orlikow and then Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. In these fiscal constraining times, I must ask the question. You mentioned…we heard today some figure of point something percentage, but could someone give me a dollar value that you believe…that you know or believe that this initiative would cost?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The response?

Niall Harney: So, there was a report from…or an analysis by City Staff delivered to EPC on July 9th that provides a dollar amount for the cost of both providing a living wage to City employees as well as external contractors. The external contractors numbers was quite a rough estimate. But that report provided a high estimate of three million dollars. When you look closer down, you find that, actually, City of Winnipeg staff, a living wage is 17.87 an hour, not 19.21, and that that cost brings it down to closer to two million dollars.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, my question is to Mr. Ryback. Mr. Ryback, are you aware that in the Manitoba legislature and parliament, people do not have the ability to go in delegation to speak?

Madam Speaker: Let's bring the questions and the answers through the Chair, please.

Councillor Wyatt: Sure. Through Chair, are you aware that in parliament and in the legislatures of Canada, you do not have the ability to come and speak in delegation like you do on the floor of council?

Kelly Ryback: Madam Speaker, I am aware of that. I'm also aware that…

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you for answering my question. And are you…no, thank you for answering my question.

Madam Speaker: Second question…second question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Second question…my second question is, are you also aware that we could also do the same thing that the Manitoba legislature does and every legislature in Canada and parliament? And would actually then ensure that members of Council would have immunity on the floor. The only thing that prevents us from having immunity on the floor from anything we say is because the fact that we allow delegations. So, we have sacrificed and allowed for delegations at our potential expense so you can speak, even though the provincial legislatures and the parliament of Canada – are you aware of this – do not allow you to speak, why? Because they want to be protected. Are you aware of that?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, thank you for the question. The response.

Kelly Ryback: Madam Speaker, I know that I am allowed to contact any elected official in any riding, be it an MP or an MLA to lobby my opinion and influence or at least convince someone of a position and to be heard.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you for the answer. So then, basically you're saying that you would support…

Madam Speaker: Third question. Councillor Wyatt, I will recognize you when it is your turn to speak. Third question.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, you're…so basically you're saying that in light of the fact that you can contact us the same way you contact an MLA and MP you would support ending delegations on the floor of council? That's the way I read your answer then.

Kelly Ryback: Madam Speaker, I am not even sure the relevance of the question to the topic, but we'll leave it at that.

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

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much. Through you, Madam Speaker, could we ask the delegate where we can get the free food back there?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Response.

Kelly Ryback: Madam Speaker, I am aware that there is coffee, tea and water that's back there. I have not been through the entire wall to say if there is anything else. But it is relevant that…if it's available to Councillor and...

Madam Speaker: Thank you. You did mention food earlier. Thank you. That concludes our question period under this delegation. Next is David Grant who is appearing remotely on a number of items as listed on the delegations page of your agendas. Mr. Clerk, yes, we have the delegation online. Welcome, David Grant.

David Grant: Thank you, Councillor Sharma. Thanks to Council for inviting us. I usually start with that because I do appreciate that this is a special effort on the part of Councillors and members of Council to listen to us. Hopefully it provides some value to us. And we realize it does take up a big chunk of your day. I also thank the Manitoba Legislature for inviting us to speak. We don't get invited that often, but it is still possible. And thanks to Councillor Schreyer too for attending the last few town halls that I've attended across the city. It shows that he really cares. And thanks to the three Councillors who hosted these town halls. This is all part of good governance. And I am so pleased to see this happening. On Public Works report three: I am opposed to Council granting another 180 days delay to staff on their photo enforcement report. It is clear that the City has not met the conditions set by provincial law in order to use photo enforcement. It's also clear that the City does not have the authority to amend provincial law with a delay such as this one. On EPC number two – Fees for Fires. Disclosure, I have never owned a rental property and know no one who does. Whenever a delegation suggests that those on (inaudible) can take action to reduce their chances of injury. Actions that have kept me safe all my life. That delegation

is prevented from speaking. It seems that rational steps to increase safety are silenced as victim blaming. This increase in fines is analogous. It suggests…it seeks to punish the victims of break ins and arson. Have any of you asked your fire and police folks to explain the steps that they can routinely take to prevent repeated fires by arsonists? We need…in my opinion, we need to save our housing stock, not see it burn again. The owner probably feels the same way. The person who is facing the increase in fires…in fines for fires. On Water topic number one: I am in favour of the huge delay in this business item. Hopefully this time can be put to good use. It should be long enough for staff to engage with Efficiency Manitoba who can then provide, at minimal cost, a series of energy saving steps much sooner and at far lower cost to city taxpayers than what is planned. It is sad that staff have not been required to present what they have done, and they've done a lot, on this topic as an interim report. On Governance three: meeting schedule. As we head into another year, we see EPC set to meet too soon after the SPCs. Combined with a plethora of verbal-only reports, this serves to hide City Hall business from public view, public scrutiny and comment. Please have staff shift the EPC and Council meetings just a bit to make sure there is at least five days after the meetings which are expected to send business to those senior level. There would be no need to waive rules on timing if the schedule were to enable full compliance. On Governance topic one: integrity report. I am in favour of…with aspects…I'm in agreement with aspects of this report, including the definition of gift. I believe that the Commissioners should be asked to include those gifts provided by outsiders that help fund city operations even when no funds flow directly to a member of Council. Such gifts should be scrutinized. They may become problematic when they involve inappropriate actions by one or more members of Council. I am in general agreement with all the changes made to the code so far. I believe that the code could go further. Since the outcome of complaints are generally for the educational benefit of all, there should be no election holiday and the 60-day limit should be extended. I suggest that a one-year period would be consistent with other codes. Since all complaints are handled in confidence, the majority of Council who do absolutely nothing wrong, would not be affected by extending this coverage. On Governance topic two: community committees and advisory groups. It is crucially important that Council stay in touch with residents. I think you all understand that. A functional advisory or residence association is one of the best ways to do this. Too often city polling is aimed to get support for an idea. The wording and so on and the target audience is…comes up with the, well, we all like it. The target market for these polls tends to skew results. There is significant room for improvement in these relationships. If not done right, a Councillor may be unaware of the downside of proposed actions. The residence groups should be provided with more complete info. These groups can be used to provide the councillor with a glimpse of public opinion. Not always supportive, but that is good to know. They can be the link that makes representative government, which we have, seem more democratic. When a member of such a group presents concerns, they should be taken seriously. New City policies are weakening the means by which Councillor collects and uses delegate comment. A healthy delegation system is a valuable tool for members of Council in making good decisions. Reports which are made verbally and reports which arrive late further weaken the delegation process. These are all good tools for good decision making and I am pleased to see this item on your agenda. Notice of Motion No. 3: this is important. We should all thank the two Councillors who put this forward. Too often City business has not been made clear to the public or even to those who must understand and deliberate it. This topic has been raised by delegations when it seems to violate good business practice and your plain language requirements. EPC Notice of Motion 3…I'm sorry, 2: good decision making depends on a robust delegation system. Any forms of deterrence such as having to come downtown and pay for parking and stay for a big chunk of the day, any forms of deterrence could result in concerns and good ideas not being brought to members of Council. When walking a few blocks to City Hall and when riding the bus did not put travelers at risk, driving to Main Street could have been considered a luxury. This is no longer true. Expecting to speak before noon too often disappoints. When you see that you are third on the list and you expect to be done by noon and the meeting runs on and then there's the hour or more of delay. Hearing all in-person delegations before going for lunch is an option that hasn't been mentioned as far as improvements to the delegation system. It should be so those delegates do not waste two hours waiting. Your delegate application system is broken. Applicants once received an e-mail for each of their applications to speak so that they knew all was well. Now, a message pops up after applying, but later, a message may appear on your screen when you are not even there, saying please apply again, but it fails to say which application has failed. Staff seem unable to go back to the reliable system or to fix the current process. I would like the rules suspended to enable me to speak in favour of Property Report Number six. My application for number six was lost days ago, and I was not informed until late Wednesday. Can I ask for that to do…that rule to be waived?

Madam Speaker: You have two minutes still on the clock, David.

David Grant: Thank you. Thank you. I will be brief on topic six. Property six is a traffic study. This seems to be a wonderful way to provide some new homes that are needed because of blunders at high levels. Most of the people who use Fermor will not live in this quadrant. Not creating new bottlenecks for those travellers should be of utmost importance. Existing traffic light intersections should be the only ones used in this study, not new traffic lights on busy arterial roads. And that was my comment. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: David? David? Yeah. It wasn't an item on our current agenda. Okay, there are some questions. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Through the Chair to you, David, thank you for your delegation. You attend many of our meetings both the standing committees, community committees, as well as Council. Appreciate your feedback all the time. And in your thought, do you think it is reasonable and fair for our processes, especially people…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, through the Chair, please.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes. Who register in delegation to speak or who register in opposition to an item, let's say, a hearing item…public hearing item, that they should be informed of any changes that are being made, especially after the fact…to an item at community committee. That they should have a right to know that information especially since they spoke in delegation for these items. Do you think that is a fair request to be made of the Clerks Office to inform members of the public of changes to an application that they spoke in delegation on?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. David.

David Grant: Thank you for raising that. I certainly believe that it is…it would be fair to have such notifications. Now, you mentioned hearings. When the item at committee is an official hearing, we do know that the City does…the Clerks do send out a paper copy of changes and outcomes. And I agree that if it was as simple as an e-mail to all the people who spoke on that topic, when it changes, I think that would be entirely fair and it is practical to do so. And thank you for raising that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, thank you, David, for your time today. Our next delegation is Laura Tyler from Sustainable Building Manitoba in support of Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste and the Environment. The report dated October 5th regarding Retrofit Investments. Welcome, Laura.

Laura Tyler: Hi, thank you. Thank you so much for having me here today. I am excited to be here because this is the moment that you can take actual action if you pass this motion to allocate budget to building retrofits. I don't want to hate on reports, but they are…as they are a necessary step along the way but today is when real action manifests. This smile is real because I'm really hopeful that today the City of Winnipeg will take action instead of just talk about or explore action. I'm not going to go into the realities of climate change because I think you all know them and, quite frankly, it makes me too sad. But I will remind you that OurWinnipeg 2045 sets out the climate target for Winnipeg to meet or exceed net zero emissions by 2050. That is 26 years. There was a time in my life where I thought that that was a long time but I know now that it is not. And it's not something that we can just keep kicking down the line. And one of those reasons we need to spend the money now is, in fact, money. The old adage, you've got to spend money to make money is absolutely applicable here. Though, instead of making money, you'll be saving money. And you have the opportunity to start saving money today. The Council has already recognized that there are savings from the carbon tax of about 9.2 million. By adopting the retrofit to reduce carbon tax payment obligations that was adopted by Council on September 29th, 2023. And I want to remind you that that savings is only about the carbon tax, it does not include the cost of energy itself. And I know I don't need to tell you about the rising cost of energy because we all feel it every day. But I will remind you that the cheapest form of energy is energy that you don't need to use. Energy that you conserve through building retrofits. The point is, there's a lot of money to save here. I know the City does not have a lot of money, but this is the kind of money spending that will save in more ways than one. So, in addition to saving on the cost of energy, I want to mention building retrofits will also expand the life of the building. So, three cheers for more money saved. These retrofits are for municipal buildings and since energy efficient buildings can be healthier buildings, that can lead to increased productivity, lower absenteeism which means that, yeah, the City will save money. Another round of three cheers to saving money. As Manitobans, we are lucky to have a low carbon source of energy with our hydroelectrical grid, but we need to protect that grid and avoid the costly investment of having to build more infrastructure. Building retrofits will help with that since it's going to be saving and using less energy. So, if we don't save that energy, then that might lead to us having to build more energy infrastructure and that will be more expensive for Manitobans at a time that we're already facing an affordability crisis. So, governments do play a critical role in workforce development and building strong supply chains when they take on projects like this. So, this means if you allocate the budget to building retrofits, then you will help every other building in the city become more energy efficient. The decision to develop a local…this decision can help develop a local workforce so that we don't need to outsource energy efficiency related work to other provinces, which will mean we will keep money spent by the City of Winnipeg in the city of Winnipeg. Better supply chains means that's lower costs for everyone who wants to retrofit their buildings. And since Winnipeg stands to be a leader of the low carbon economy, attracting critical investments to our city, this is a really important thing to make sure that everybody can get on board with. So, I really hope I did a good job of explaining that because we really want to make sure that life is affordable for all Winnipeggers while still bringing in important economic development to the region. So, the money-saving opportunities for this budget allocation is more for just…more for than just for the City itself. So, it's an opportunity to save money for everybody. And Mr. Mayor, I'm sorry for putting you on the spot, but I do want to remind you that you highlighted the importance of building retrofits and geothermal installation in your election platform. And we cannot go and do geothermal or any other kind of fuel switching until we have gone through the building retrofit process because you don't want to waste money on systems…and installing

and building systems that are bigger than you need because of the energy that you haven't saved. So, the point is, this is the budget. It's the…by allocating this budget is a chance for you to make good on the values that you express in your platform. So, please, make sure that the money is in the budget for retrofits so that we can finally move from talk to action. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Laura. And I want to clarify, this item is a notice of motion, that the delegate just spoke to. Notice of Motion No. 1: moved by Councillor Mayes. Are there any questions? Okay, seeing none, thank you, Laura, for your presentation. We will now hear from Curt Hull in support of the same item. There will be five minutes, no questions. And there's a submission that will be put on the public record.

Curt Hull: Thank you, Councillor Sharma. Good morning, Mayor Gillingham, Councillors and staff. Thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak. I am peaking in support of Councillor Mayes' motion. And I thank him for standing up for the citizens of Winnipeg by bringing it forward. The motion before you reveals a startling fact: if the same mathematics were used as for the building energy retrofit proposal as was used for the Route 90 widening project, this would be the conclusion. And I quote from the motion, "The retrofits will produce 36 percent more social environmental benefit than the Route 90 widening proposal approved by Council at less than one-third of the cost." 30 percent…36 percent greater benefit for one…less than one-third of the cost. So, the fact that Councillor Mayes' motion was necessary forces me to question whether or not this Council truly understands its obligation to act on climate change. The obligation that they themselves have undertaken. OurWinnipeg 2045 set a climate target for Winnipeg to meet or exceed net zero emissions by 2050. The community energy investment roadmap, CEIR, a really important document, was developed to show how we can achieve this target. The CEIR report was developed at significant cost to the City of Winnipeg and with input from many experts and community members. The CEIR report not only shows an actionable pathway off of our reliance on fossil fuels for heat and transportation, it shows how investing in this pathway will have a substantial net financial benefit and save households money. This report was adopted by Winnipeg City Council in 2022. In May 2023, this Council sought input to the development of Winnipeg's Strategic Priorities Action Plan. At that time, I and a number of other citizens presented in this chamber to suggest the CEIR…that CEIR provide a central guiding framework for that plan. Council's Strategic Priorities Action Plan that was subsequently released, did not mention CEIR even once. This Council seems to have an intention to expand the roadway system and will fit the calculus to justify that aim but is unwilling to apply the same methodology to a project that arguably has more benefit at less cost. The consequences of climate change continue to mount. Sooner or later, the impacts…its impacts will become intolerable. We will have to realize that we can no longer burn fossil gas to heat our buildings. This means that we must find a way to heat all of our buildings electrically. To enable that, we need the efficient…the efficiency of heat pumps and we need energy efficient buildings. The work to making that conversion needs to start now. Let's use CEIR and apply consistent determinants as to what the priorities should be in that process. Thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Curt, for your presentation today. That concludes our delegations. There's no questions under the suspension of the rules for new delegations. We'll now get on to reports, the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 16th. Mr. Mayor, noting there's an amending motion for Item 4 and there's a conflict for a member for Item 7. So, we'll stand those…no? Okay, just Item 4.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED OCTOBER 16, 2024

Mayor Gillingham: Just Item 4, okay. Then I would introduce the report and move adoption of Items 1 to 3, 5 to 11.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: I'd like to pull Item 3 and Item 6.

Madam Speaker: 3 – Public Art in Major Capital Projects. Item 6 – Proposed Asphaltic Concrete Lane Pavement. Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: 2 and what is report 5 again?

Madam Speaker: 2 is Vacant Buildings, 5 is the Tri-Level Agreement – Inner City Revitalization. Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, and 11.

Madam Speaker: 1?

Councillor Wyatt: 1, 2, 3.

Madam Speaker: 2 and 3 have been pulled.

Councillor Wyatt: 5.

Madam Speaker: 5 has been pulled already.

Councillor Wyatt: 10 and 11.

Madam Speaker: 10 – Audit Recommendations, 11 – Traffic Signals Branch. I will call the question on Item 7, 8, and 9. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Customer Service and Wait Time Improvements within 311 Service

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

Mayor Gillingham: I will wait to hear from my…yeah, I'll wait to hear from my colleagues. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I pulled this item down from the agenda because this is one topic, Madam Speaker, that we're continually hearing from our constituents on, and that is 311. And the frustration that we get from our constituents who often reach out to us after they have tried to go through 311. And I want to make it very clear that I am not criticizing 311. I'm not criticizing the staff at 311. I know they are doing the best they can with the resources they and the knowledge that they have and the training they have. I am basically pointing out the fact that the initial idea behind 311 was to be proactive to allow residents to get a hold of somebody easily inside the Public Service of the City of Winnipeg to address concerns that they have. The other part of 311 that has never occurred and that part is not happening now because folks have to wait quite a long time still to get a hold of 311. The other part that was supposed to occur, Madam Speaker, was 311 was to provide the City of Winnipeg data and the departments data of where there are shortfalls in service levels to allow the City to improve their service levels and to act upon those shortfalls. And it was to provide a centralized system to allow us to get that information and provide the departments with that information so that they can address it, ideally, at budget time. None of that has occurred. Today, 311 is a modern day firewall to the city…citizens of Winnipeg. They basically can't get through to us. Back before, they could call the departments direct. And the departments direct actually could get them responses and they knew answers. And they were able to get responses to their concerns quicker than they are getting today. A lot of citizens now just find it frustrating. They hang up. They are not going to wait. And their concern goes unaddressed and they get disgruntled. And they find that the firewall of 311 is acting exactly like that. Now, I know the Mayor committed to increased resources for 311, and I think that's a great initiative. Frankly, I think a better initiative would have been to redeploy the staff and go back to the old system which we had before because, clearly, we're not implementing this system, which is to allow the departments, publish all the numbers, allow everybody to call the departments directly. We could still get the data, that's not hard to do of where the shortfalls and the funding are. That's just a software system that could be built to do that to incorporate all the calls coming in from the various departments, but at least residents could get a hold of the departments. I remember when we rolled 311 out, there was a big controversy at the time, people couldn't even get a hold of the public library in their area to see if a book is available. Well, we exempted that. We allow residents to be able to call their pubic library and we still publish the numbers of the public libraries. But Madam Speaker, when you look at 311 today, there are some simple things. If you don't even agree with what I just said, if you say we want to keep 311, then the very simple thing we can do overnight that would increase 311's efficiency probably by 50 percent, and that is, we shave off 311's transit calls because they get bogged down with transit calls and create a separate number for Transit. I don't know what you want to call it. You know, 211 or whatever. But you know, have a separate number for Transit and the transit calls coming in because quite often that's what people are calling for, when's the next bus? When can I get my transfer, right? Guess what? Come January…June of next year, 311 is going to be totally bogged up when we roll out the new Transit Master Plan. My frustration here, Madam Speaker, is that we are not addressing…we have created a system which has closed Winnipeggers off from the services that they rightfully often have legitimate concerns and questions of. And the irony is, that when a resident calls us, and you all know this, that when a resident calls us and asks us for help on a matter and then we go the department about it and then the department says, well, what is their 311 reference number? Well, in some cases, the resident said I couldn't get one because I couldn't get through and I just got frustrated and hung up. And I have great sympathy for residents who deal with that. I mean, if any of you have been on the phone with a wait to call another level of government about a personal matter or any other matter, you know how frustrating it can be when that phone call is not picked up in a timely manner. And we brush it all off now

on 311. And I want to stress over and over and over again; it's not the staff at 311. They are doing the best they can with the resources they have. They have been trained as well as anybody else to handle these calls. But in some cases, the 311 staff do not have the knowledge, do not have the information on matters pertaining to department policy or department implementation or recommendations that the departments themselves would have if they were to get the call. So, it's not only a firewall, Madam Speaker, for the residents not able to get through City services, it's acting as a firewall to our departments. They don't have to hear from the public. They don't have to hear the complaints, nor do they see them in some cases, I would argue. They can brush it off. So, they don't really…they are totally out of touch with what the public is thinking, too, or concerns that they have. It's a great convenient thing for a lot of our departments to turn off, which is what they've done in terms the concerns of the public and the services that they're receiving or they're not receiving. I think 311 needs a massive reform. This report doesn't address that, that is why I am stepping it down to talk about that. I hope this matter does not go away and that it's something that's taken seriously by this Council and by the Mayor and Mayor's Office because, frankly, it is a mess right now. 311 is a mess. Not the fault of the staff or the management there. Not the fault of the people working there. The fault of this Council and senior administration to fail to rise to the initial initiative of 311. If you want to make it work, go back to the original plan and implement it and give them the resources to do the job that they need to do. And that means significant more resources based on the calls that we are getting and the accountability that we wanted, which was to flow the information back to the departments on the shortfalls on the servicing so they can address that via the budget process, even if it means that the Budget Working Group is bogged down with more work because all of a sudden, we've got all these 311 issues coming up that we never expected because that is what 311 was supposed to do in the first place. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Next, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I'll just put this on the record; I think many of you know I've been very critical of the 311 system for a long time. This report came forward. I am really looking forward to seeing what the department is going to be proposing to do for continued improvements and value for money. So, the Budget Working Group gave them more funding. We heard from a delegate this morning that that funding, I think he said, wasn't being used. What I was told when this came to EPC was that the funding allocation whatever was being negotiated through the collective agreements. So, that is why this is delayed. So, I am going to hold optimism here for 311. I think everyone knows in the Public Service. You know, we've got an interim CAO, we're going to have a new CAO. I think the message is very loud and clear from the Mayor and from many citizens that we want to see improved customer service. 311 is the front-line next to us, I would say. So, I am going to hold optimism here because I, too, Councillor Wyatt have been frustrated for years on 311. But we have put more money into it. We are asking for a plan to come back. Now, we've also…and I'm going to sit down with Councillor Allard about this, we've got…there's AI, there's options. I'm hoping the department comes back, you know, using new technology, using different ways that we can get information because I'm sure many of us sit on calls. Many of use chat, many of us use…there's many avenues to get information when you are on the internet with other organizations. And I think…I am going to remain optimistic that when this report comes back that it's going to be innovative, it's going to be using technology better than we have and it's going to lay out a clear plan to improve customer service delivery. So, thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I didn't mean to speak to it. I will be supporting the report, Madam Speaker. But I just wanted to speak to 311. I don't know if people in the public or anywhere realize this, but a lot of the calls to 311 are related to what our offices call case work, which we have executive assistants who try to help deal with it. As…well, I know in my…in my ward, Madam Speaker, case work is always quite large. And if you look at the 311 calls, our monthly reports that we get, a lot of it are files of complaints. But I want to draw something to the attention. If you really want to improve 311 response times, and improve that, what we need to be doing, Madam Speaker, like…like reporting potholes. Like, yeah, but there is a lot of things that have to be reported. If they're not reported, they're not dealt with. But ultimately, if we funded an operational budget that was appropriate enough for the Public Service to stay on top of these items, Madam Speaker, there would be less calls. There would be less service requests. A lot less in the case of my ward. And so, I just want to point that out. If you really want to see improvement…because if our budget keeps going the way it does and we don't, for example, expand…add enough employees to keep the grass cutting cycle, for example, to say, a 10 day cycle or whatever, Madam Speaker. Rather than…it's increased ever since I have been on Council, there's continuous non-funding to deal with the expanding city and the service that's being provided to…I can tell you for sure in my ward, has been reduced in order to serve the suburbs. And what we haven't be done, Madam Speaker, is properly fund the Public Service to do a good job to prevent all of these calls. And there is a lot of complaints about bus service. We are trying to improve that. But Madam Speaker, my office lately…and people stopped complaining even, they are just angry and they'll stop taking the bus because sometimes the buses don't even show up. They are late. And then, all of a sudden, they don't show up. It happened to me the other day at the Concert Hall, Madam Speaker. So, and I filed a 311 complaint, because you know what? Being a blind user out there, I don't appreciate that. You know, I am a busy person and so are the people out there who are using the transit system. Or there is a lot of people, you know, if you didn't report, say, a curb that was busted up and it's on your boulevard that you are supposed to cut the grass and take care of but the curb is busted and

sand overflows or whatever. If you don't report it the same year that the…that the snowplows caused the damage, the City won't deal with it. So, there you go. Another problematic situation that can be addressed if the Public Service had enough operating dollars to provide top quality service. So, I will leave it at that. That is another way that you can improve the efficiency and effectiveness of 311 who, by the way, are the intake and then it goes to the various departments to deal with. And again, we are funding those departments appropriately and things…maybe we don't get those calls as much.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I believe my ward gets about…

Madam Speaker: The clock, please. Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Well, Madam Speaker, you don't have to worry about that. I believe my ward gets about 4,000 311 calls per month, something like that. And I'll…I use the 311 system, the citizens 311, much more often than I use the Councillors' one to check on 311 issues. Probably, oh, I don't know, 20:1, I will test the system on a regular basis. For real issues. I am not there to waste 311's time, but I will use the 311 system. One thing I know is the biggest pattern of confidence and relief I have is the professionalism and goodwill of the 311 workers. This is another case where we are looking at trying to fix our budgetary problems where we have the least budgetary problems. That is part of it. 311 workers don't make a living wage and that is where we are trying to…that's where we're trying to find our savings. Madam Speaker, I don't really think we at City Hall take our budget efficiencies that seriously. And I know that is a…that's a…could be a mean thing to say, unfair thing to say, but what am I supposed to say, Madam Speaker? We are looking at cutting savings exactly where we know we've had the lowest rate of inflation. Where the wages have been the lowest rate of salary or wage inflation in the City's budget in our lifetime. And that is where we are trying to find our savings, not where our biggest increases have been. We can all explain how that is true. Every one of us in this room can explain how we have not been told by the City where we've had the greatest inflation rates and we've never had that broken town for us, not in a report. And we get lots of reports. Ask Janice Lukes, she's even said a couple of meetings ago, City Hall can sometimes be reported out, we get so many reports. But we do ask for these reports at the same time. I have asked for a report on our highest rates of inflation, I haven't gotten it. I have created my own report, which we can all do, shouldn't be just on me, on one councillor, on where we've had our greatest rates of inflation. And yet, the City says…doesn't say one thing or the other. It gets criticized here in delegation, but the City as a group, as a Council, as a City, as an…as a corporation has never addressed it. Interesting, however, we try to cut costs on 311, which is the City's lifeline, in a sense. The City's lifeline…the citizens lifeline to the City. Madam Speaker, 311 workers do not make a living wage. In fact, Madam Speaker, I am going to make the point that there are 311 workers that use food banks. They are not the only ones, but I'm going to say this: one thing I know, it is backed up virtually every time I use the system. Oh, when we're dealing with the complexity of a system like the City of Winnipeg, using a triage system like 311, in which it's a general triage system. It no longer goes from department to department. These workers are there to assess with a citizen who doesn't know, doesn't necessarily have to know what department they are supposed to go to and try to filter out what exactly the nature of the problem is. Madam Speaker, I have tested the system before I was a City Councillor. I have tested the system constantly, regularly as a City Councillor. And one thing I do know, one thing I…one of the greatest confidences in terms of City workers are the 311 workers. They have been professional. They have been patient. And I don't…you know, sometimes you get upset, you get frustrated because you're dealing with something about the city and it's frustrating. Including just the process of phoning 311. I have been impatient. And I…in fact, I don't think I did anything exactly wrong, but I should know better given what I know about the inadequacies of City Hall for, sort of, my impatience. Nothing I've said in particular to the 311 workers. But having said that, I have been impressed with their patience. Madam Speaker, I am more impressed with 311 workers. Well, I don't know, you can get into trouble. Well, let's just…let's just say this, they were…they are at the highest edge of professionalism for dealing with citizens' concerns, as anybody else in the city. And that just should not go unnoticed. We are trying to solve our budgetary problems where we do not have one. We do not have a budgetary problem with the lowest paid workers, with 311 workers. That is not the problem. It's a lower part of our budget than ever before. Trying to solve a problem where we've actually had the solution, if you will, is backwards and it is not working. So, let me tell you, Madam Speaker, here is the question: we have been looking at cutting, in terms of a proportion of our budget, the lowest paid wage earners in our city. How is it working for us? Madam Speaker, we raise every single year every tax, fine, fee, levy, and rate. We have spent our reserves. We cut services. We sell more debentures. So, how is it working for us, Madam Speaker? It is not and it never will. It is impossible. So, we look where we shine a light over here. We'll shine the light over there. That is not really where the problem is, but that's where the light shines, so let's look over there. Easy pickings. How is it is working for us? It's not. Because that's not where the problem is, it never was. By the way, what do I…what do I mean by it never was? Because when those workers in that general wage area of the City, of City employment, of City workers' wages back decades ago…oh, by the way, when we didn't have the same rate of taxation on people in proportion to their income. When we didn't have the same height of water and sewer rates in proportion to peoples' income. Back when we had more community services. Back when we had higher reserves. Those lowest wages were higher, Madam Speaker, it's just a fact. And if you want to show me how it is not true, fantastic. Give us the report. So, Madam Speaker, I've got to ask again, how is it working for us? Trying to save our budget by continually

cutting the lowest wage earners of the City. And in the case of 311, they do a great job. Some of them are at food banks. But you know what?

Madam Speaker: An extension of time. Let's speak to the wait time improvements. I think you've made your point.

Councillor Schreyer: I'm…yeah, Madam Speaker, wait time improvements means let's keep our budget up for what we are trying to do, unless we want to revamp this again and go back to other formats such as when we had it directly to the departments. Anyway, Madam Speaker, let's not blame the 311 workers. Thank you.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Rigorous debate on an extension of time motion on a report that will come back. So, just to…just to kind of summarize. This is a report that will come back. There's an extension of time being requested here. I do note that about a year ago, it was reported that 311 wait times had gone from over 11 minutes, on average, to under…under six and five something minutes per average. That's in part because the investment this Council made in the 2023 budget to add more funding to 311's budget to improve the service and reduce wait times. It's part of a larger package of initiatives that has been undertaken. The report of which we're going to get back in the coming days. And I look forward to that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We've noted Councillor Wyatt in opposition. Item 2, Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Amendments to Vacant Buildings By-law No. 79/2010, Fire Prevention By-law 35/2017 and Revised Fee Structure for Vacant Building Fire Response Fees

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a matter that we have worked on as a Council and continue to work on. It's a priority of mine to address derelict properties within the city of Winnipeg. I know that it's a priority shared by all members of Council as well. Our Public Service is working on this and there's more to come. What we have before us here is an adjustment that EPC has supported. An adjustment recommended by the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service to change the fees associated with building fires. And so, I will wait to hear from my other colleagues before I conclude. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: I stood it down first. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, then on to councillor…thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I am actually voting for this report. But, again, I have been listening to the media. This is something we are working on. This…we created a stick to pummel. In most cases though, the owners of these properties are victims, Madam Speaker. They are either victims of living in poverty and couldn't afford to pay or get house insurance, for example, in R2W, which is very difficult. Insurance companies are very leery because people are setting houses on fire all of the time. You just have to keep looking at the e-mails we get about fires here, fires there. It's the same in Councillor Gilroy, same in Councillor Santos' area. There's often quite a few fires where the housing stock is very old. It is in bad shape. If a landlord owns it, maybe it is vacant and derelict because you can't live in it. And they don't want to spend the money to renovate, which is why we have a stick, actually, we want the people who do own these places and do have the wherewithal, we do need a stick. But Mr. Darrell Warren in William Whyte where they're dealing, probably, with…at least when it comes to single, duplex, triplex issues. The…probably the largest amount for any neighbourhood. I can't say for sure. I haven't looked at latest numbers, Madam Speaker. But we did hear that there are those who don't have the wherewithal and they are doing what we are supposed to do. We told them they had to put extra strength boarding on so people can't get in there and set fires. Or, you know…and usually, they've already gone in there and stole all the copper out of it or whatever. Again, that building is victimized. It's just like people…we are doing…solid waste is doing a great job cleaning the bulk dumping and garbage dumping on back lanes, Madam Speaker. However, the victims, they're still dumping it on private property and those victims are expected to clean it up. Even the City is a victim on Selkirk Avenue. There's constantly bulk waste dumped on a lot we own. And they keep dumping it there. So, it's not in the back lane, but because it is on there, I don't know if Property and Development...well, anyway, that is garbage. But when it comes to…I am still not familiar with any real carrot that we are offering, Madam Speaker. So, we've got the stick, but I don't see where there's any carrots being offered to people who don't have the money. And remember, in my ward, I don't know what portion, and Mr. Warren insists that they are all wealthy enough, that own those properties, to fix them. But

they don't know the underlying data. But our Public Service is looking at it and they're working on it and they're cognizant of it, Madam Speaker. And I know they have been going after properties and doing the demolition and putting the bill on there. But the Public Service does know that those property owners do have the wherewithal to do something expediently to protect the health and safety of the immediate neighbours and the neighbourhood. And so, we are doing that. I wouldn't necessarily call that a carrot, but there needs to be some kind of carrot to help people who own these properties. They are not all wealthy landlords. Sometimes people are renting out a house or own the house and they've been renting it out only because they couldn't sell the thing for whatever the mortgage was when their parents or whoever died and they ended up taking on that house. That happened to me, Madam Speaker. I ended up with a house and I ended up with a renter who trashed it. I didn't have the money to fix it. Thank god I had some people to help me. But Madam Speaker, there was no carrots. No carrots. So, there's other motions we're trying to do to see if somehow there's carrots that we can offer to deal with these vacant, derelict.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: I support…again, lowering the fees, I think, is okay and expectation is to pay. But we will end up with a lot of these properties through tax sale, but it takes five years.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thanks, Madam Speaker. I stood this…or Councillor Eadie stood the item down. And I want to thank him for doing that because I recall when this legislation came out through the Charter to allow us to have Vacant and Derelict Building By-law. And at the time, I was on the Property and Development Committee. And you knew it was being enforced based on the appeals that took place. And we at every Property and Development meeting for at least two or three years or more, we had every…at the beginning of every meeting, appeals coming forward for individuals saying they need more time to make the changes to a building that needed to be upgraded. And the rule is quite simple, you know, it's…and it can be enforced fairly easily, that in the event that a building is vacant, all windows must be either glazed, in other words, the glass in the windows, or fully boarded. And then, it's subject to the by-law, the licensing requirement which renews and the fee goes up exponentially, requiring the property owner to make the upgrades or they have to pay the fee. And it was a great motivator for property owners to see upgrades to buildings. Now, that was when we actually enforced the by-law. And I would argue right now, Madam Speaker, you can do all the changes you want in terms of changing the fees, which is what this report is about. But if you don't increase the enforcement and you actually make it and we start doing the enforcement that Gary Sekulski did when he headed the division. To his credit. Who is no longer with the City, he retired. We will…we will not see the changes we want which Councillor Eadie spoke about. And I agree with Councillor Eadie, there are some people who are struggling in terms of the property ownership. But there are many, also, Madam Speaker, who are "slum landlords" who have let the property go for various reasons and have no interest in fixing it up or spending money on it. They are just sitting on it for whatever reason. Maybe it is a benefit to them tax-wise to have these deductions and…to them or their company who owns the property. And so, they just let the property sit. But I can tell you right now from what I have seen in not only in Councillor Eadie's ward, I have some in my ward. But other parts of the city, there are many who are not following the Vacant and Derelict Building By-law requirement in terms of either having all the windows glazed or all the windows fully covered and boarded up. And so, it's easily enforceable. We just have to enforce the by-law and that is not happening. I would know it is happening when you start to see people showing up in appeal at the Property and Development Committee like we did before. Then we know we're actually out there enforcing the by-law. The by-law is actually…it was legislation giving us power. We had…it went through…it was spearheaded by former Mayor Glen Murray who identified the problem at the time. And a lot of due diligence had to be done with regards to property rights, and not to infringe upon them. And that was all sorted out through the legislation and the powers granted the City by the Province of Manitoba to bring this by-law in. And we are not enforcing it the way we once did. If we did enforce it, a lot of the problems, a lot of the issues that Councillor Eadie speaks about and others have spoken about of the issues we see in the North End. We've had the North End and parts of the city: William Whyte, West Alexander, Centennial, light up since January 1st. Ask the fire department how many calls they've had. Record calls. Something is happening out there. There's no doubt something is happening up there. And if we don't think that…if we don't address these issues that one day certain parts of the city could light up like Watts did in 1990 in LA. Guess again. Guess again. We have to start enforcing this by-law. We can address all we want when it comes to fees which this report does. We have got to get the staffing levels up. We've got to…and the irony of it all, Madam Speaker, is we are doing enforcement on certain things. I am getting calls from business owners who are being told that they've got to get this and they've got to get that now. You know? And it's causing a lot of headaches out there in the private sector. I can tell you that right now that they've been directed – Property and Development permits staff – have been directed to go out and do all this enforcement. And some of it is worthy, a lot of it is not. People are being told to get a building permit that even (inaudible)…the building has been operating since 1920, well good luck. Try and upgrade that based on today's building code standard. But we are out there. We are enforcing people who put a happy face on a tree. Oh, well, you can't have a happy face on a tree, that you put on a tree. Oh, no. That can be enforced. But this, which we actually need the enforcement on? Or the host of other by-law related issues in this city that I could drive down any street of the city and I could point out

one violation after another that should be enforced not going enforced. And we have been calling for this enforcement over and over again. And a consolidated by-law enforcement moving us out of the situation we have now where even Councillors don't know which staff to call in terms of by-law enforcement because they are divided up all over the place. And that's supposed to be happening as well, I understand. But…and we are still waiting on that one. This, Madam Speaker, needs enforcement. And that's why I'm not going to support it because you could…you can increase the fees as much as you wish, if it's not being enforced, they mean nothing. They mean nothing. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Seeing no further speakers. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. I'm not going to speak long on this, but it's a really important issue. And in for my ward…and not just mine. And the way we go about this is important. I have heard here today, it's not the first time, it is a question like other things that affect our communities. It is a function of enforcement. Having said, that we are trying to solve things by what? Increasing the punishment when we haven't even enforced. Councillor Eadie made the point, that's what...essentially, what Russ Wyatt is saying. Councillor Eadie made the point, where is the carrot, where is the incentive? And we do offer that in other sectors of what the City does. In this case, I want it to work. What matters most is that it works. Are we saying that if we increase the fines, we will have a better…we will have a better record of dealing with vacant and derelict houses? I am not certain of that at all. What we do need is enforcement, absolutely. And if there is some sort of incentives that can help, that is important, too. What is going to help us reduce the number of derelict houses in Winnipeg? I am not certain that this is it. What I do believe is enforcement and one…some sort of incentive to help. We have to look at solution here. It's not just about punishment, it's about solving it. And I don't think we've tried with the by-laws we have because it is a question of enforcement as well. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just for the record here, my councillor colleagues are making some comments that are just not factually correct. The fines are not actually increasing. They are decreasing if you read the report. 26,000 dollars is currently the minimum fine. And it would be proposed to sit at 10,000 dollars. So, that should be clarified for the record there that this is not increasing. In fact, it is an increase from the Public Service recommendation, but it is not increasing. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, I want to thank Councillor Duncan for the clarification there. Just a couple of things, ultimately, I think we have to keep the goal in mind. The goal is to take the 700 properties that are currently vacant and derelict and get those transformed and redeveloped into housing or commercial industrial or whatever the case may be. That is ultimately the goal, the aim. And so, this is yet one other means by which we are trying to encourage property owners to avoid the penalty of fires on their site that would come with fires on their site by transforming and making the investment. A couple of councillors, Councillor Wyatt being one, was correct in saying that there are some property owners who seem to do nothing with their property year after year after year. It just seems that they are not interested. They're just sitting on the property for whatever reason hoping maybe sometime the value goes up or parking their money, whatever they are doing. We need to get those properties developed. We have a time in our city right now where know we need more housing. As a Council, we are working very hard to get more housing built and encourage more housing to be built all across our city. The vacancy rate, last time I checked, on rentals is still below two percent. It's a tight housing market. We need as much housing as we can get. These 700 or so sites, most of them, represent opportunities for housing to be developed. And so, what we have here is a recommendation. It's a bit of a compromise on a recommendation the Public Service made to reduce the fines, as Councillor Duncan just said, from…for firefighting on these sites from approximately 26,000 dollars down…they recommended five for the first fire. We have come to look at landing on a number of 10…10,000 dollars. Every time our fire trucks roll up to fight a fire, every time police have to respond to one of these sites, it represents a danger to our own staff. It represents a danger to the public. It represents, perhaps, a danger and damage to neighbouring properties when these sites, these properties, are left undeveloped. And so, the message is clear, again, to property owners. I don't think we can say it, you know, clearer…clearer than this. If you are a property owner in the city of Winnipeg sitting on a vacant and derelict building, get it redeveloped. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Schreyer: For information: did I…do the fines not go up when they're not paid? That's what I was talking about, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, there is no opportunity for a point of information.

Councillor Schreyer: Anyway, just thought I'd offer that.

Madam Speaker: We can certainly take that discussion offline. Thank you. Next item, Mr. Clerk. Or we will vote on this first. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. And Councillor Wyatt recorded in opposition. Next item, Item 3, please.

Item 3 - Public Art in Major Capital Projects

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I pulled this because I am getting tired of our lack of progress on these public art projects. I know the Mayor had it in his platform to reinstate the operating grant to the Arts Council which was a good policy initiative. We had…one of the first votes I ever cast here was on a budget in 2011 that included 500,000 dollars for public art. We've actually gone in reverse on that. You might say, yes, but here we are, we've got this spiffy motion about dealing with the Arts Council. Here was the motion December 3rd, 2014, EPC. December 3rd, 2014, almost 10 years ago. Four of us in the room who would have been in that room. Public Service reviews ways to incorporate artistic components in all new municipal capital projects and report back in 180 days. A motion that looks startling like the current 10 year later report back in 180 days on incorporating artistic components in all major capital projects. So, I don't know what we can do. Maybe the Arts Council's fault, frankly. Might not ours. I don't know. But surely, we can do better than yet another delay on this. We made that decision to take the money out of public art funding. I know I fought to keep it. I know councillor…then Councillor Gerbasi fought to keep it, but all budgets are compromises. But how many 180 days…I mean, I feel we've been on this tune for literally 10 years and haven't made much progress. There are ad-hoc projects. There's one Councillor Rollins and I have got some public art built into the St. Vital Bridge rehabilitation that connects our two wards. There has certainly been some at the Waverley underpass. And certainly, some other public art projects. But can we not…perhaps the Mayor can give us some encouragement that there won't be another 180 days as we start the second decade of this. Surely, we can get something nailed down on this. 180 days more, fine, but surely, we can get something concrete worked out on this.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, there was a time shortly after my first term, Madam Speaker, art was being implemented within major capital projects. For example, the renewal of the Osborne Bridge and they introduced an element of art there. When they renewed Selkirk Avenue from Salter to Arlington some years ago, there was in the capital projects money for public art pieces and so on. The circumstances with that one, though, is in the…on the Selkirk Avenue, the budget…the cost of that capital project went over budget. Well, it didn't really go over budget. What they did is, they redirected money for public art into the actual road and sidewalk renewal. Well, as well as they put in some black light lamps and stuff like that to provide for...potential for art. But…and the Selkirk Avenue BIZ continues to try to…they have these artful orange spheres that are there. But I digress. What I wanted to point out, Madam Speaker, we're going to wait 180 days. But what we need to realize here, Madam Speaker, is that this is about, well, economic incentive because the arts world is that sector of our economy. Artists make money. That is how they make their living, Madam Speaker. And when we provided 500,000 or whatever we do for public art, when we do these things, Madam Speaker, that is economic…it's part of economic growth. Growth of the art sector for artists so that they can make a living, so they don't have to…you know, they're…anyway. The capability…I have a number of friends, Madam Speaker, who that's how they made their living, through art. And anyway, I just…I am digressing again. We need to move on this because this is about economic growth. And that is how we should be looking at it. Not looking at reducing it, which is reducing the economic capability of artists in Winnipeg. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, Madam Speaker, this, to me, represents a cut in funding because as was pointed out by the previous speaker, capital budgets, previously, included a percentage…major capital budgets, for public art. And now, the decision of the budget, which was a recommendation of EPC in March 20th, 2024, is that the Public Service be directed to work with the Winnipeg Arts Council to develop a program that would include public art and major capital projects and report back to the Executive Committee in 180 days. So, I'm assuming this is a…this is a cut that has gone forward in terms of our capital budgets. Because in the past, as was pointed out, public art was automatically included as part of public…as part of a major capital project as funding as a percentage of that capital project would be earmarked to public art. And now, we are asking the department to work with the Winnipeg Arts Council. Now, maybe there is a clarification that needs to be made, but that's the implement…that's the…that is the way I read the potential request of EPC here.

Now, if it's…we are requesting them to work with Public Works to use the existing funding within the capital budget that will still be there for public art, and we are asking them in terms of a program. But it is not clear if the program is for the purpose of giving guidance and helping Public Works to determine what that public art will look like or represent as per a percentage of the existing capital project which is for public art of a major capital project. Or is it for the purpose of saying to them, we want programming and funding? And so, I am not too sure. I wanted some clarification around the intent from EPC. And if that could be explained, I would welcome that. Because…and you know, I agree that maybe that is something that needs to happen if the funding is remaining in place in capital projects for public art. I experienced this firsthand with the Plessis underpass where we were kind of left, well, okay, what are we going to do for public art? Well, there was no programming because we didn't have the experts like the Winnipeg Arts Council involved. It turned out, we did something pretty interesting and with the naming of the public art and the underpass going to south Transcona, "Welcome to South Transcona. Welcome to Transcona." And that was done…I don't know if it was done by artists, but it looks darn good. But anyway, Madam Speaker, I would say this that…and it was public art, but it's functional public art, which I think people appreciate versus just public art that they sometimes see and wonder why we are spending the money on that. So, that is…that's my question. If it could be…some light could be put on this request of the notice of extension. Is it related to reducing the capital project in lieu of Arts Council taking over the program of public art, or is it just simply that we are asking them to assist in guidance in terms of performing and implementing that public art as part of a major capital project? Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, yeah, we've been…everything we do. If you look around this room, if you look anywhere, anywhere, you can't go one second, one minute, to agree without looking at aesthetic. It's a funny thing. We say…we think we are not a very artistic oriented society, maybe. But I can't look anywhere, anywhere in this room, where I am not looking literally at aesthetic, and where resources and talent, money, tax money, was put into aesthetic. Anyway, and it's a funny thing, eh? Because I didn't even come to that conclusion until just like a few years ago. Everywhere you look, you're looking at some form of aesthetic. It's not merely just for functionality. Not merely that. And that goes through all sorts of society, including all of the resources we put in even to advertising, as an example. So much of what we do is aesthetically oriented. And so, what we're talking about here isn't new at all, as it's been already said by other councillors. We have been doing this for years. Actually, we've been doing this for generations here, we've been doing it for centuries. So, this isn't new. I guess my concern, and I learned this at a young age, when it comes to these things, which are merely about aesthetic, but aesthetic is about something larger. Why do we love architecture? Why will we put extra money into architecture? Why would we do such a thing? We could just have slabs, slabs of concrete and things like this. Well, I guess one could say in our era of post-modernism, that is what city hall…city hall is in some buildings. But why does it matter so much? So, this is not new at all. There are reasons for why it comes up as a motion here. And to me, the major issue is this, it's going to be cost. And I believe to taxpayers, it's going to be about cost. They're not against the art. It is going to be about how much it is going to cost. I learned that a long time ago. And nothing has changed. We are still an aesthetically oriented society. In fact, as things get more expensive, let me tell you, do you think people are going to say, yeah, my taxes are going up for everything, including for construction, especially, if they are out…if they are allowed to be told that by the City Hall. So, where do we…where are we going to cut costs kind of thing? I think when it comes to art, I think we really have to watch our budget. It is really important. You know, as an example, as a great example, as a matter of fact, it's Winnipeg 150. Happens to be that one of city hall's treasurers, the longest serving member, staffer, worker in this building of this generation, over 31 years in this building: Chris Hurley. He's an artist, he's a photographer, he does wonderful things. For free we could put his photography celebrating 150. Celebrating City Hall's treasure of someone…I don't even know who has worked in this building more than 31 years consecutively. Chris Hurley has. We could be celebrating his art throughout the…his art of the Assiniboine River right here on the second floor for free. I think that would be an excellent celebration of art, of the city, of 150, of city hall and it wouldn't cost us a thing. It's just an example. But that's what I mean. If we're going to talk about art, we have to be careful how we spend the taxpayer's money. We have to be careful how we celebrate that. And that is my primary concern. Art in public spaces, we have been doing that for millennia. Right now, more than ever before, we need to watch the taxpayers' money. There's great ideas in terms of having to do it effectively, fairly, cheaply and sometimes great art like Chris Hurley's for free.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in terms of this agenda item. Just noting that I was in a conversation just last week with respect to proposed plans that are coming up for Pembina Highway and that passes over Abinojii Mikanah. And to my surprise, and again, this is a Council directive in terms of capital projects, capital construction projects that are over a certain value, that there would be a one percent inclusion of public art. I was actually quite surprised to find out that for this project there was no public art considered. And it is a capital project in excess of 30 million dollars or thereabouts that a public art piece would not be installed. So, again, based on the conversation that I was involved with with Councillor Lukes and Public Works staff, we asked them to ensure that public art is a factor or a portion of this project that is going forward. Again, it is a Council directive. It is something that will enhance the aesthetics of our city. And it's

important for us to take pride in terms of those aesthetics where public art is a part and function of our growing city. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Madam Speaker, I am getting up to speak to this matter, which the matter before us is an extension of time. I do so love hearing all your voices today, however, Madam Chair…Madam Speaker, we are talking about an extension of time. That is what we are talking about. We are not talking about what public art is good or bad. We're not talking about where I get public art. I like it or I don't. Yeah, well, I think cranky is an overstatement. We have a lot of serious issues to talk about today. And I know everybody has a right, but I do ask the Speaker to constrain councillors to speak to the issue in front of us, including delegations. A delegation isn't about public art today, it's about an extension of time. So, I ask the Speaker to…and let's call on us as well. I am more than happy to sit down with coffee and talk about public art until we're blue in the face outside this chamber. We'll have that chance when that public art comes forward. But again, we spent now half an hour on this matter, which is wonderful information, I guess. It has no bearing to the motion in front of us which is an extension of time. So, I please ask the Speaker and Councillors, focus on what is in front of us. We'll have time to speak to this matter when it comes back to us. So, again, yes, I apologize. I am getting cranky. But as we've seen that we go through this…we go through this agenda how many extension of times are we actually debating other or discussing other issues that aren't extension of time? I have a lot of work to do in the ward, we all do. So, I'd like if we could all just focus on what is in front of us, not that…wherever else we are talking about as an extension of time. So, on the extension of time, I support it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Schreyer: Councillor Orlikow's comments a point of order or not?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow was using his speaking time. Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: In terms of the use of time on this issue.

Madam Speaker: No. No, it is not. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to close.

Mayor Gillingham: I don't know, Madam Speaker, if it's appropriate, but I am going to say, Councillor Orlikow's comments are my favourite speech of the day. So, thank…I thank him for it. The irony…in fact, the irony, I get (inaudible)…the irony is that we debated for over 15 minutes on an extension of time for a 31…for a 311 report, and in the intervening time, I found out that what we debated for over 15 minutes, 311 wait times, wait times are down to two minutes. So, on this matter, which is an extension of time, there was one question that Councillor Wyatt asked, I thought it was fair. Just to close, Councillor Mayes rightly took us back to 2014 when there was a public art…call for public art to be put into capital projects. We put it into capital projects kind of here and there. There was no strategy. What we voted on in 2024 budget, include…the 2024 budget included a clause that said that the Public Service be directed to work with the Winnipeg Arts Council to develop a program – we have never had a program before – to develop a program that would include public art in major capital projects. And what we have before us here is our staff saying they are working with the Winnipeg Arts Council, they need more time to develop that program, can we give them another 180 days. I want to see a program, most of us want to see a program, I think, on public art and capital projects to vote upon. So, I support giving our Public Service 180 days more to develop the program with the Winnipeg Arts Council. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 3. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Next is Item 4, Mr. Clerk.

Item 4 - Living Wage Framework

Madam Speaker: This item does have an amending motion that goes with it, Motion 1. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to introduce the item.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll ultimately be consistent with my votes and my words on the record about the living wage matter. And I will be supporting EPC's motion to receive the matter as information. I look forward to hearing from others, both those who are introducing the amending motion and debate on the topic.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. The amending motion is moved by Councillor Gilroy, seconded by Councillor Mayes. Councillor Gilroy.

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

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 4 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 16, 2024, be amended by deleting Recommendation 1, and replacing with the following:

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

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. This is longstanding issue. I think I have been working on a fair living wage since I have been on Council. So, this has been well discussed, Madam Speaker. This isn't something new. We've had many different reports come through…come through talking about different amounts. We have, you know, the amounts from Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives to, you know, City amounts. So, you know, this has been a well documented debate throughout the many years that I have been here. But I think, Madam Speaker, what this comes down to is kind of a belief on what we think people should be getting paid here at the City of Winnipeg. And really, mine has come from my experience working within my community. And I am having a hard time with the fact that we have people that aren't making a living wage that are right here in my community that are really doing a really hard job, Madam Speaker. And those were our 311…311 staff. And they get a lot of flack, Madam Speaker. I think that we have all seen within our offices the discourse that are coming through and how people are talking to their representatives, how people are talking to staff. There has been a change, Madam Speaker. There has also been a change in the way people look for employment nowadays, Madam Speaker. Nowadays, Madam Speaker, people are looking for employment in terms of where do they want to work? You know, and back in our day, it was, you know, you find a good City job, it's got good pensions, good benefits, and you stick to that job. That is not what we are seeing, Madam Speaker. And in fact, in my area, I really struggle with getting staff for things like our wading pools, for things like our rec…rec centers. You know, and that really impacts areas where we have a higher needs of poverty where we need higher levels of services because families aren't able to drive their kids to ballet classes or, you know. It's just a different level of service that is required and a higher level of staffing, Madam Speaker, that we are just not seeing. And I think we all got a way of how we're going to make that work, but mine is through a fair living wage. And making sure that we provide good jobs for families and that we are the leader in terms of poverty reduction, Madam Speaker. That we at the City are leading the way. And we are saying that everybody that works at our City is going to be having this living wage and we're leading that. Other cities have been leading that. Other corporations have been leading that…leading that, Madam Speaker. And quite frankly, we are so close to achieving that. Like, the cost is very, very minimal of ensuring that we are a fair living wage city. I want to send…I want to send a message to our staff that we care about this issue and that we care about them, Madam Speaker. I want to send a message to citizens that this is important. And that when it comes to poverty reduction and ensuring that we are being an employer that cares and values its workers, I believe that it starts with us, Madam Speaker. That we take that lead. I also believe that, Madam Speaker, that if we want to look at keeping the staff that we have, we have to look at how we value it. And I think that this is a good way of ensuring that we are sending messages to our staff that we do value them. I also believe in sending a message to, you know…to our economy out there that this is a place where people want to be here at the City. That these…you know, these are jobs that people are going to be attracted to our city because we have good jobs and we are paying a fair living wage. I am also hoping, Madam Speaker, it is also going help deal with some of the areas where I think they should have a higher level wage, Madam Speaker, like our 311 workers. Which I think we all agree, they get a lot of flack at a lot of times, Madam Speaker, but we all know that the troubles with 311 usually comes from within the different departments and how we filter that information out. The staff itself are dealing with a lot of hard issues at times, Madam Speaker, and that they deserve that pay. I think it's just time that we get this…that we decide as a City that this is important to us. I don't believe it is a high cost, Madam Speaker. You know, I think, you know, some of the delegates here spoke about it. I think it's 0.1 percent cost to the City at our overall budget to say that we care about ensuring that we are a fair living wage employer. So, I guess it's just going to come down on how we feel as a City. And so, I do think it is time we get this vote. You know, I do think it's time we do this vote. And it's going to be what it's going

to be, Madam Speaker. I…I'm looking around the table and I am not as confident as maybe I once was because, Madam Speaker, we did have this vote already and we all did say we believe in it. But then now, the time has come for us to put action towards and I am not…I'm hoping that we put action towards, but I'm not sure if we have the votes here today, Madam Speaker. But I will be one. I will be one person that is going to stand up. And I'm going to ask for a recorded vote, Madam Speaker, because I think it is important that we record that vote. And I will be standing up for fair living wage and for us to be a fair living wage employer. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Lukes: I'll just make this short and put it on the record, I don't think we should be negotiating wages on the floor of Council. That is not our job. We have multiple unions in the City, we have multiple paid union leaders. That is their job. That's not our job to be negotiating wages on the floor of Council. I…you know…and to Councillor Mayes' point back in 2019 with the police pension. He argued it was part of a collective agreement. He was right. I was, you know, making a statement more that I actually supported the concept. But it's…you know, we paid a price for that. So, I do not think we should be organizing and negotiating wages on the floor of Council. That's just not what we do. We have unions that do that, people pay union dues so that the union people can do that. You know, that is their job, that's not our job to do this on the floor of Council. I just want to have that on the record. So, I won't be supporting this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Well, we have debated this a number of times. As Councillor Gilroy says, there were nine votes to do something back in July. Councillor Rollins isn't here. I don't know where Councillor Wyatt is. We'll see where the votes land, I suppose. Probably not successful, but worth talking about. A couple of things; first, good seeing Mr. Delbridge here who's been championing this for some years. I think I have had more fallings out and then getting…patching it back up with Mr. Delbridge than anyone, except possibly Ryan Palmquist who was Councillor Allard's former EA who is a very fine school trustee. And he and I continue to do some work together. So, but it's a serious matter. A couple of points: I mean, we certainly had people at the last meeting in July saying, well, I'm really in favour of this, but I'm voting against it. And Councillor Wyatt talked about doublespeak, I think, correctly. So, if you are in favour of it, now is the time. Take some action, vote for it. Certainly, when I introduced a 15 dollar an hour motion back under Mayor Bowman, that Councillor Santos added an addition to have a living wage study done as part of that. I don't know where that ever landed. I don't think we ever adopted that, obviously. But that was something that was brought forward at that time. Certainly, thanks to Councillor Lukes for her comments about the police pension vote. That is accurate what she had said. To those who later said, well, no, no, you were wrong because we needed to vote to send a message that we could do it unilaterally. And then, when we lost that, then they came to bargain with us. Actually, no, the police unit was saying, we'll bargain with you. That is what the law is. That is what is in the collective agreement, it is bargainable. So, the idea that only by losing and paying a huge hundreds of thousands of dollars in damages, which Councillor Lukes referenced, that somehow that was a master stroke politically and I was wrong all along to actually vote the way the arbitrator said. I can't quite follow it all. No, the correct vote then was what we did…what the arbitrator said, you have to bargain it. And some agreement has been worked out, not as a result of the people who said we can do this unilaterally. The weakness, though, with what Councillor Lukes is saying is this motion goes beyond just people who are unionized with the City workers. And that is something Mr. Delbridge has pointed out over time, if you increase our wages continually it just increases the attractiveness of contracting out. That is a fair point. Hence the more broad idea here of sweeping in people who aren't covered by the City workforce, who aren't unionized in almost all cases: garbage workers, Transit Plus workers, they're not unionized. So, why don't we take a look at that in the broader context. And why is that worth considering? As I've said here ad nauseum, that is what we put into OurWinnipeg. That is what we voted for. That's in OurWinnipeg to have a living wage for not just City workers, but beyond that. Now, there are those…and the silver lining here to me is, if this loses, well, you have people saying, well, OurWinnipeg is kind of a shopping bag, you take some here, you take some there. It's not really a plan so much as it's a nice host of intentions. Fine. And when we get to debates about zoning and people tell me like I am an eight-year-old boy that it is in OurWinnipeg and we have to do it that way. I will remind them of this moment where we actually have a living wage commitment in OurWinnipeg, but we don't seem to feel we have to do that. Councillor Lukes makes a point in some ways. We can make these decisions. We don't have to follow the letter of things. We can, in fact, make exceptions. Good precedent last month, too, down there with Lemay Forest. We've heard over and over, there's a housing crisis. But we had the maturity to unanimously vote to not go with the Planning Department recommendation of 800 units on that site. We said, well, there is a housing crisis but that doesn't mean we have to approve everything in some desperate attempt to have density everywhere. I'll be coming back to that as well as we move forward in some of the discussions we are to have. Because we can make intelligent decisions. We can draw a line without having an idea that we have to do everything. So, go ahead and vote as you see fit. Thanks to Councillor Gilroy for bringing this forward. But let's remember, if we're saying, well, it's in OurWinnipeg, but we certainly don't have to do everything that's in OurWinnipeg. Fine. And we will be seeing this in spades later today when we get to that community energy investment road map where we haven't done any of it. But if that is our commitment, well, we take some of OurWinnipeg and we leave some, that's fine, let's take that same philosophical approach when we come to making some very important decisions

about densification and changing of neighbourhoods. So, hopefully Councillor Wyatt is back and hopefully is prepared to vote for this as he was back in July. Hopefully Councillor Santos is prepared to vote for it as she once was. But she had made her concerns clear as a member of the…member of the Budget Working Group. Though she is not on the Budget Working Group now. So, this is an important item. I think it's an important commitment to the workers. And finally, in terms of costs, can anyone in the room remember what the public administration said the cost would be when we voted and I voted for it, and I'd vote for it again, we voted to add 23 million dollars to the Southwest Rec Center budget. The admin report said there are no financial implications. There actually are financial implications on the operating side, it's a million in the first year and 1.5 million...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer moves extension to work past noon. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Mayes: I still have two minutes left.

Madam Speaker: Just to…just work past the 12 noon. Thank you.

Councillor Mayes: Oh, sorry. Sorry, Madam Speaker. So, yeah, we are making financial commitments that are not in the budget. We are making some financial commitments. This is not much in excess of that as far as I can tell. I think it's an important commitment to make. So, the idea that, you know, the cupboard is bare, well, we've heard that, but also, we did vote for 23 million dollars more in debt room. I think Councillor Rollins voted against, some others did as well. I voted for that. I agreed with Councillor Lukes on that. But there is a cost to that, let's not dance around that. There's an operating cost to servicing that debt. So, let's keep all of that in mind as we move forward on this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I think seeing the hour there is a commitment to break at this time and reconvene at 1:15 p.m. Let's start at 1:30 p.m. sharp. Like, 1:30 p.m. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
October 24, 2024, at 1:36 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of October the 24th, 2024. We are on the report of Executive Policy Committee, item 4, Living Wage Framework. The next speaker is Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stand…I hope…you know, you might say it's inefficient or inappropriate debate because we've been debating this for, I don't know, a long time, Madam Speaker. But I rise because it is a very important issue. And I am speaking in support of the amending motion from Councillor Gilroy. But I just want to…you know, Madam Speaker, I'm hearing on debate about somehow this is somehow in negotiation with labour. Now, Madam Speaker, while it is not in the amendment, the Executive Policy Committee of Council which is Chaired by the Mayor of Winnipeg, is the human resource committee, Madam Chair. Now, you know, if you wanted to frame it appropriately, the human resource committee of council is responsible for laying out what we are trying to get in negotiations that are undertaken by a contractor and the HR division of our corporate corporation, Madam Speaker. And I'm quite aware that they are because when I served on the Winnipeg Police Board, where I got a better idea what goes on, the parameters were set by the Mayor and EPC, whoever the Mayor decided to involve on that, to negotiate with the Winnipeg Police Service. What we were trying to achieve. Now, Madam Speaker, there is nothing saying that Council can't give direction to the human resource committee that, you know, negotiate, at a minimum, a living wage. Nothing. This is what Council is doing today. We are not negotiating. This isn't…this isn't a collective bargaining pro…thing. What we are saying is, Council is saying that we would prefer that the City of Winnipeg provide to at least it's bargaining units that there is a minimum living wage. And that should be what is negotiated. In the past, Madam Speaker, what had happened is, there was a negotiation because, as Councillor Gilroy appropriately points out, we can't recruit workers to work doing difficult jobs unless we are paying them a living wage. Now, there was a collective bargaining negotiation where they did increase the value for certain categories of workers with the City, and they did increase it to try to attract more, say, lifeguards. Now, the problem we are having in the neighbourhoods, and business improvement zones are neighbourhoods, a business or whatever. And I'll give you another example where this year working as green team workers in difficult areas where we need somebody to do it because the City won't clean the garbage off the sidewalks. They won't put in enough litter bins and collect them. We have to do it. But what we are hearing from green team workers, if I knew what I was dealing with, there is no way I would have took the job for that wage. If it was a living wage, something that was more helpful towards them, then that helps. Now, so, what I am saying is, is we should be promoting within the city. I'm not going to give a lecture about the North End. You know, there was an attack on higher paid City worker jobs starting in the '80s through the '90s. We gutted things. The way we got out of paying people a decent wage, we contracted out garbage. And they paid the crappy wages. So, Madam Speaker, what we need to do, and you see the decay all around the

downtown. We're putting money into downtown. You see the decay. Part of the reason that that decay is in the North End is, there's no ability to get living wage jobs for people who have a…might have a skill to collect garbage, pick up litter off the streets, whatever, what have you. If we don't provide living wages, and that is not even enough to take care of…to take care of our…to take care of our problems that we are having, which, for example, nobody is making enough money now in the North End. They don't have decent paying jobs to repair their homes and then they end up vacant and derelict in the end. Sometimes a landlord, a big landlord, somebody who is renting out lots of properties, will come along and they'll buy them up. But they are not paying the money. But the point is, is…and then, to the pay rents, the reason that people who are living in poverty are going to the North End, to the West End, Spence, the reason they are living there is that's where the cheapest rents in the city are. So, when you go to look at HAF things and you say…or CMHC says, well, the medium market rent for that particular area, the lowest medium market rents are in the North End, the West End, central, Chalmers in Elmwood and there is a lot of people living in poverty. The only rents that they can afford are in St. Boniface, in the older part. So, you know, if they have opportunities to get decent jobs so that they can raise their families, take care of a house, buy a house, never mind…at the living wage, that is not enough to buy a house. That is enough to take care of a rental home and so on and try to take care of whatever needs they have. So, I don't know why anybody could be opposed to this because this is one of the things that goes to the heart at why it is costing the City hundreds, even million dollars, whatever it is, the cost to fight the fires. The cost to deal with the problems, the cost for the police service to deal with the problems. It is socioeconomic issue. And living wage, Madam Speaker, goes to that. I could make more money in the underground criminal economy than I can if I got a job. If you want to help correct the problems, you should be voting for this, at least a living wage. Give our bargainers, for example, if you want, although, anybody who provides contract services to the City should be providing a living wage as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to quickly put some notes on the records. I had made some comments, I believe, previously on this issue and just wanted to reiterate. Hearing some of my Council colleagues, one that really resonated with me was specifically the points made by Councillor Lukes. The debate on the living wage is, of course, an important one, but it's a discussion that I firmly believe that belongs at the bargaining table; between CUPE leaders, associates and staff. I remember all too well the experience of the police pension by-law reform. In fact, I still carry that stress with me to-date. And quite frankly, I just don't want to go down that route again. And during that police pension reform, we heard from one of our other colleagues, the Police Association expressed that a strong preference for the addressing those issues at the bargaining table. However, in this case, I don't want to point any fingers or please don't take this personally, but we haven't heard similar requests from leaders at the union. So, instead, what I'm hearing is them asking us as policymakers to sidestep the very tools that are designed to do these kinds of negotiations. But let me be clear, I support the principle of the living wage. And I did so when we first broached this idea and this topic in my first term. But I also believe we made good progress in addressing poverty and lifting families up through our other means. One example is our social procurement process which ensures that when we issue RFPs, we're actively assisting Winnipeggers who are struggling to find jobs and create better opportunities for them and their families. If this is truly a priority, I suggest we revisit this conversation when we work on our next four-year strategic action plan. That is where we should decide our top priorities as a Council. For now, my focus, and I hope it's all of our focus, that we should remain on funding the liveable, safe, healthy and happy city that we had all supported earlier in this term and that I am completely committed to under this current strategic action plan. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Number of issues here. I don't know how to start off, but let's put it this way, back a few years ago, there was an idea here at City Council that to save money we would reconsider in the middle of the collective agreement with the Winnipeg Police Service, reconsider their pension plan. And that is how we wanted to save money. It's not my opinion, that happened here. We all kind of were involved in the debate on that one. And in fact, I said to my fellow councillors, don't do this because it goes against the spirit of the collective agreement and it's actually not going to fly. Well, that was my prediction. In fact, what happened was, a judge ruled against the City of Winnipeg in favour of Winnipeg Police Services because of what…what was the term? It infringed on the collective agreement. Having said that, that was my perception of it and my prediction, which ended up being right. So, not my opinion, that's the record of this. I wasn't the only one who was right about it. But I did say, don't do this because it goes against the spirit and we're going to get in trouble. And sure enough, legally, by a provincial judge, our position was upstaged. It was trumped, it was overturned. That didn't stop the majority of members of this Council to have the perspective that they could change the collective agreement or (inaudible) part of the collective agreement, change something in the middle of…in the middle of a collective agreement term. They literally wanted to change the terms of a collective agreement regarding the pensions. So, we already have councillors in this room that have that perspective that you can do this. However, in this case, I'm going to give you my advice, which was right last time three years ago, four years ago. And that is, it won't go to court. If you do it this time, it won't go to court. See the difference. If you were in favour of the idea four years ago that you could go and challenge the Winnipeg Police Service pensions four years ago.

If you believed that then, well, believe it now because this one's going to be a lot easier, believe me or judge me. Vote as you did last time on the police pension. Vote like you did last time. Vote with Cindy Gilroy and myself against today's…against today's motion which just says, you know, receive it as information. Vote for it this time. And I am saying, you are not going to get in trouble from the provincial court, because it is not illegal. Why isn't it illegal? Why are we allowed to do it this time? We weren't allowed to do with the Police Services, the majority of Council thought we could. But why can we do it this time? Because it doesn't abrogate any collective agreements. Because it's actually not part of a collective agreement. So, if your current concern is about dealing with collective agreements, well, I can understand that, kind of, if you voted with me last time against trying to get some money out of the police pension four years ago. That I get. But if that is your argument, believe me, this is not interfering with the collective agreement. I am going to reiterate. I'm not sure how to say this any more simply. It is a little complicated. Four years ago, people thought in this room, we could play with the police pension. We couldn't because it was part of the spirit, if not the wording, of a collective agreement. This is not. So, if that is your concern, your worries are allayed unless you truly believe that a court, that a provincial judge is going to overturn this motion to have a livable wage. It will not happen. How do we know this? We've got precedence already. We already had Niall this morning explaining how it is that other cities in Canada, other municipalities have livable wage policies. It doesn't abrogate a collective agreement. It doesn't go against the spirit of collective agreement. Voting for the…for the…against…when you're trying to get money out of the Winnipeg Police pension, that was ruled out of order. This is not. So, if that is your concern, don't worry about it if that is your concern. However, if you didn't vote with the majority of Council four years ago to try and get money out of the Winnipeg Police pension, I understand that. And if you want to be consistent in that perspective, I respect that. That is your perspective. The idea that we are somehow interfering with collective bargaining here but we weren't four years ago when it came to the police pension, that is just not true. At least not in terms of the supreme…the provincial court. But kind of…that one was kind of coming, that was kind of obvious to me. That is why I said it in this council chamber four years ago. Because that was kind of…that one was obvious, and it's obvious now to me. No provincial judge is going to say, this is…this abrogates the collective agreement. This is not collective agreement, this is giving us minimum standards. As Councillor Santos just said, we've got policies regarding standards, regarding procurement standards. And by the way, we are allowed to have labour standards including, even if it costs more, certain standards of workplace environment including safety. That's where we are at. That's okay. I agree with that. In terms of abrogating collective agreement or interfering with collective agreement, we tried that four years ago. That won't work. This is not this. Now bear in mind, Councillor Eadie and others have made the point today that when it comes to getting work that matches their wages, well, let me tell you something. I have been in the workforce for 30 years. I have had jobs, salaries and wages higher than that of a city councillor in three instances. The big one was as a roughneck. Made far more than I do as a…notably more than I do as a city councillor. I made as much as the Mayor, as a matter of fact, while I was a…while I was a roughneck drilling for oil throughout Alberta. Don't tell Councillor Allard I used to drill for oil. But anyway, that's the reality. However, I've been in all sorts of jobs and some of them were minimum wage and a lot of jobs in between. So, in that job experience, a lot of…a lot of work environments. A lot of people I worked side by side with, shoulder to shoulder with. Half of the people I've worked with in my life are Indigenous. And I'm going to tell you, those were in the lowest paid…paid jobs. Essentially, not always, depends. You never know. But for the most part, you never know when you're going to be working with an Indigenous person. Could be digging trenches, fixing foundations. You could be working in Steve Ashton's ministerial office in the legislature. You just don't know. Having said that, I have had a lot of experience analyzing working…working environments. And seeing how people work and the psychology…psychological effect of wage. We also know that when it comes to 311, we know that it is hard to keep our good professional, truly, and I've experienced this on a regular basis every month; professional and patient and sensitive, 311 workers. It is hard to keep them, why? Because if they are good at their job, they're going to leave. Isn't that sad? They are so vital as the frontline, the interface between the City of Winnipeg and the people of Winnipeg. And yet, this is where we are going to skimp? As an example. Madam Speaker…

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: A liveable wage is important, Madam Speaker. It's good for the City of Winnipeg and the people of Winnipeg. Thank you. And it's not…it's not what's causing our budgetary problems. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers to the amending motion and the main item? Mr. Mayor? Or Councillor Gilroy, your opportunity to close.

Councillor Gilroy: I'm allowed to speak again? Yeah, okay. Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thanks for everybody for the debate. I think, you know, for me, this really just comes down to what we really believe in as a city and providing a fair equal pay. I heard my Council colleagues. I don't believe this…this is a decision, actually, that needs to be done through our contracts and our unions. I think this is a decision that we make as Council on how we want to be perceived as a city, how we want to be perceived as an employer. And if we want to make sure that we do provide a living wage. That is something we decide. That is not something that is decided, I don't think. Other negotiations, yes, that's not our purview, but this is one that's up to us, it's our decision. So, I hope that you join me. I'm going to ask to make sure it's a recorded vote. But I hope that you join me because I do think this is the right thing to do. I think, you know, things have changed.

Employment has changed. And we know that we are struggling with getting our own staff. You know, even with…you know, people are talking about the wonderful pensions, the wonderful benefits, but we're still struggling getting staff. And part of that is that, you know, we haven't been paying in some…some areas, we are not paying well enough. So, let's do the right thing. Let's make sure that we are fair…fair living wage city. And let's do what we wanted to do in our own guiding documents. So, I think that we have debated this enough. So, through you, Madam Speaker, I hope that my Council colleagues support this.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Yeah, so I will not be supporting the amending Motion No. 1. I will be supporting the original EPC recommendation to receive the matter as information. To me, wages for our union employees are set through collective bargaining and so, that is where this matter should be. I have been consistent in that. I also note that when Felicia Wiltshire, who oversees our communications, 311, reported on this or was at EPC, the last Executive Policy Committee meeting, she did indicate that right now through the special wage adjustment that was negotiated through collective bargaining that part of the reason the report for 311 is delayed is they are till in discussion with members of her staff. And so, that needs to play out. And so, I think that, yes, as many have said, there has been a lot of discussion on this. And as I said, again, I will be supporting the original motion to receive this matter as information so that wages can continue to be set through collective bargaining. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I will call the question. Thank you. All in favour? Yes. The…there is an amending motion we're going to vote on first: amending Motion 1 that's been circulated. Moved by Councillor Gilroy, seconded by Councillor Mayes. This changes the recommendation that's in front of us today. That's the first vote and the second will be the main item, as amended. If it's…I got it…I got it here. The amending motion, we're going to have that vote first. If it…if it fails, then we can vote on the item that's before us to receive the item as information. Okay, good. Clear? All in favour of amending Motion 1, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Schreyer, Wyatt.

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 8.

Madam Speaker: Motion 1 is defeated. And now, on to the main item. All in favour? All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Lukes, Santos.

Nays

Councillors Allard, Eadie, Mayes, Orlikow, Schreyer, Wyatt, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, Councillor Gilroy.

Madam Speaker: Yes. The vote count, do you have that, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 8.

Madam Speaker: The recommendation is lost.

Councillor Wyatt: I move that the clause be re-put now in light of the decision that we just did. The clause be re-put in the affirmative.

Madam Speaker: The clause to receive as information?

Councillor Wyatt: The clause be re-put as was…as was worded. The…point of order. The decision of EPC to receive it as information has been defeated. Therefore, Council has a right to vote on the actual clause that went to EPC, as has always been our tradition and our practice.

Madam Speaker: The vote stands. The clause before us, the recommendation, was voted on and it's been defeated.

Councillor Wyatt: I don't want to get into a debate with the Chair. But just, the clause went to EPC, EPC moved to receive it as information. Council's elected not to receive it as information, therefore, Council in the past has had the opportunity to vote on the clause. We've done that before. We can vote on the clause itself now, which was unaided by EPC's…

Madam Speaker: I have never seen that, Councillor Wyatt. So, I would move on to the next item.

Councillor Schreyer: The motion did not come from the administration to EPC, it came from councillors to EPC. There was an original motion from this circle, from this group, that EPC may have had a certain vote, but this Council did not. If it is not a recommendation from the administration…

Madam Speaker: We're going to look into this, okay? And we're going to move on to the next item in the meantime.

Councillor Wyatt: Prior to the end of the meeting today on this matter? Why not?

City Clerk: Council has rendered a decision on the item, councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: No, but I'm talking about what Madam Speaker just said, she's going to look into it.

Madam Speaker: With the Clerk, yes, we will look into your question. I don't know when we're going to have an answer.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, when it comes to councillors, always gets to come back to Council. And therefore, that motion gets to come back to Council. That is the thing about a councillor's motion that hits Council rather than through community committee or standing committee and that is not from the administration. When a councillor's motion hits this floor, it has right to come back here. EPC might have a recommendation, but that is theirs, not Council's. And not those that are movers.

Madam Speaker: The question was to have a...Council made a decision on the item. You are asking to vote on it again?

Councillor Wyatt: Just as clarification as the Chair's asking, the motion was moved by Council, from Council, not from administrative report that the…that the matter be considered. It went to EPC. EPC gave a negative recommendation. That was voted down. Thus, the opportunity should exist to be able to vote on the clause itself. Now, it just so happened that a motion was moved to amend to do exactly that. However, I don't know why that was done, it was done, but we should still have the opportunity now to vote on the clause itself. Which is the clause…the original clause that had been prior to EPC (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: The recommendation in front of us was lost. Just a moment.

Councillor Gilroy: Can we have the votes read back on who voted for what on the items?

Madam Speaker: We're going to move on to the next item, okay? We will come back to this. We can take a recess if we need to. The recommendation in front of us was lost, okay. Now the next item, Mr. Clerk, Item 5, please, thank you. Mr. Deputy Speaker, have a seat please. The next item. Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'd just like to make a point of order. I would just like the Clerk to…procedures by-law lays out all the rules and procedures related to us voting on motions. So, if before the end of this meeting, it would be good to have the precedence and workings of the procedures by-law explained to us as to why we can't then consider the actual motion from Council versus EPC's recommendation.

Madam Speaker: There was something different put forward in an amending motion that was also voted on and it was lost. Okay, on to the next item.

Councillor Mayes: I mean, isn't this exactly where we were in July with (inaudible) that was defeated through receiving it as information, hence the limbo, hence the motion.

Madam Speaker: It is nothing different…

Councillor Mayes: Back to limbo. Okay.

Madam Speaker: Than that time. Exactly, it's nothing different.

Councillor Schreyer: Every motion that is generated from Council gets to come back to Council regardless of the recommendation of EPC. That what happened in July, Madam Speaker, my understanding was a recommendation from the administration, not from Council. We still get to vote on that motion, as was passed by this Council to refer it.

Madam Speaker: Next item, Mr. Clerk. And as we said, we will get back to Council on the discussion that we've just had.

Item 5 - Establishment of a Tri-Level Agreement - Inner City Revitalization

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

Mayor Gillingham: Yeah, I think I'll wait to hear from my…I think Councillor Eadie has a motion related to Item 5. So, I will just wait on that. Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, no worries, colleagues, I do not rise to speak to this issue. I move to refer back to committee.

Madam Speaker: Okay, yes.

Councillor Schreyer: Motion in favour of or not, or will we just be filtered through EPC and it's up to them? I thought the motions that come through Council get to come back through Council regardless of EPC judgment.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie has referred this item back to EPC.

Councillor Eadie: I move referral. I don't want to explain. There's a good reason why it has to be referred back to Executive Policy Committee and I move that referral. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: It's a straightforward referral. It will come back here after EPC deals with the item again. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Just to clarify on referrals. We can't…correct me…I guess point of information, we've already spoken to the issue.

Madam Speaker: This is Item 5, a different item.

Councillor Orlikow: Oh, we are past. Again, I thought we were going on No. 4 for three years. So, great. Super.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you for your concern. Thank you for your concern. Let's not get out of hand. We have a lot to go through here today.

Councillor Eadie: For my colleague from River Heights, I am doing this to prevent torture. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Good. Okay, so voting on the referral. All in favour? Contrary. That's carried. Item 6, Mr. Clerk.

Item 6 - Proposed Asphaltic Concrete Lane Pavement Local Improvement on block bounded by Dunraven Avenue, Blenheim Avenue, St. Mary's Road, and Overton Street

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Waiting to hear from my colleagues, Councillor…or Madam.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Surely, Blenheim, not Blenheim. I would move to lay this over for a month. Very small street. I think I can meet with these folks. It…one property determined whether it would pass the threshold or not. So, when I have a chance to talk to these people about the implications of paving or not paving. So, if we can lay over for one month.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of layover? Pardon me, is there any other speakers first? No? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: You can call the question, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 10, Mr. Clerk.

Item 10 - Implementation of Audit Recommendations Report - 2024 Quarter 2

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

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, we're on Item No. 10? Thank you. I rise only because there is a matter that we really need to have a look at, and that's the archives and records management audit. This was an audit, by the way, that goes back to the term 2014 to 2018 has not been included. I would really encourage the Executive Committee to dig that one up as a recommendation to get that moving. The reason I say that is only because, well, basically, all the decisions we make here and everything made at community committee and everything made at EPC and standing committees, there is real concern about the standard the City has in place in terms of archives and record management and the decision making that we have and how we are keeping track of those decisions and how they are being recorded and maintained. So, everything that we do including done by the Public Service where we have delegated significant authorities to senior public…members of the Public Service is at stake here. That if we do not have, for example, accurate records of previous decisions made being kept, previous councils have done that. I recall when I first arrived here way back when, we used to have a shelf down in the…doesn't exist any more thanks to all our IT, but there used to be a big shelf of all of the minutes of all the previous council meetings going back to 1972. And actually, even before that of the City of Winnipeg council meetings and books all literally up on the shelf. All in print. Now it is all electronic which is great. However, if we are not keeping track of our decision making accurately, if there are issues arising and concerns about that which the auditor has expressed in the past, and it is one that I know is about as exciting as watching paint dry. But nonetheless, it's one that I think we need to do. So, I am only flagging that one. It was identified at the top of the list, by the way, of an auditor's report…one of the last auditor's report in the term 2014 to '18. Top of the list of future audits to undertake. Which is, again, it was titled The Archives and Records Management Audit. I would encourage everybody to go back to look at that. But I would encourage EPC to consider this as something coming forward. Thank you.

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

Mayor Gillingham: I want to thank the Councillor for flagging that. Appreciate that. I will look into that. So, with that, you can call the question, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 11, Mr. Clerk.

Item 11 - Traffic Signals Branch - Procurement and Contracting Audit Report

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. I would just note that I remember having quite the robust discussion on this back in, I think it was 2022. And one of the things that was the outcome with Councillor Allard part of this as well, working together to call for this audit. So, I want to thank the Public Service for their report. I look forward to hearing from any other colleagues on this matter.

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

Councillor Wyatt: I stood this matter down just because I was not here during that period of time when this all erupted. I read this report with interest. Just a couple of things and things I've noticed, you know, one of the things I kind of got a kick out of was Councillor Browaty putting on a regular agenda, I think, forget where it was on Main Street, he wanted a traffic signal installed, so he just put it on the agenda every meeting to require Mr. Patton to show up and speak to it so that it actually got done. And but…well, it's interesting, because…and then, on top of that, the department has indicated to me in writing – in writing – that certain traffic signals are going to be installed this year. One got done, the other one not. What I find interesting about the report and, of course, we then communicate that to our constituents. Right? This is what is happening this year. And then, the department, well, we can't do that, Councillor. But then, what I find interesting is on page 17, bullet number one, two, three, four, five: we noted that Peoplesoft…that from the Peoplesoft, that seven out of eight of the POs, purchasing orders, were still open with a total encumbrance value of 716,604 dollars from 0 to 490,000. Even though the association contracts had ended. What does that mean? It means, basically, money is being tied up that could have been moved automatically to another project. But they are sitting in a system that hasn't closed the purchasing order. I'll jump over to page 16 now, the page before, last bullet: Public Works Finance advised us that they are currently

exploring ways to standardize the accounts payable process for consistency within their department. Well, that's directly related to purchasing orders. And so, I am concerned about this, Madam Speaker, that we have these outstanding issues in this department and the division of Public Works that are not being addressed. And we're seeing it showing up, literally, in terms of the services and the capital budgets that have been approved and commitments that have been made to area councillors that are not being fulfilled. And a lot of these commitments, by the way, are related directly to development. So, in other words, we are approving new developments, and a lot of these cases these facilities, though the City installs it, are being built forward to developers who are having to pay for these improvements. So, it's fully funded in some cases and in some cases not, but in many…many cases it is or partially funded and they're…they're not being installed. And we are seeing issues with regards to how the department itself is operating still. And so, I am flagging this, put this on the record so that the recommendations herein, we are receiving it as information, but that…you know, I think this is a significant report that has come forward, the audits reports. And I would encourage the Executive Committee, even though it's to receive it as information, that it should keep this alive and flag it somehow going forward. Because clearly these are issues of not…and I know that the audit…auditor does come forward with the recommendations and lists all the recommendations. You know, and they will say that 96 percent complete or 98 percent complete or whatever the case may be but that this matter be stayed on top of because of the significant issues within this branch of the Public Works Department. Thank you.

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

Mayor Gillingham: I want to thank my colleague for his comments. You can call the question, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Councillor Wyatt noted in opposition. Okay, that concludes reports under EPC.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION

Madam Speaker: We now have three notice of motions from the September meeting. Councillor Wyatt, your opportunity to introduce your motion on remote work arrangements.

Councillor Wyatt: I would like to call the question on it. I think it is self-explanatory. I would like to call the question in light of the fact everybody doesn't want to have to...I would like to call the question. Right to the point.

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Wyatt, would you like to restate the motion? There's been a request for that. If you'd like to rise, please. It's on the…

Councillor Wyatt: Therefore be it resolved that Council immediately direct the CAO to end the work from home practice and to issue a directive to all City employees to return to their respective offices. It's self-explanatory. Call the question. Recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And there is an opportunity for others to speak, just as you were trying to earlier. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Appreciate the motion from the councillor. I do want to acknowledge the good work of our acting CAO, Mr. Sherwood Armbruster, who has already made a move to bring more…more of our staff back into the office more frequently. In fact, moving from what it currently is right now where some staff are home all of the time, now into the office at least three days a week. I think that we do have to understand, as well, that there may be, I'm not sure of this, but there may be some individuals who were hired on the agreement that they could work from home certain days of the week. The more we get staff back in the office the better it is, in my belief. And so, I, like a lot of other councillors around this chamber today, would like to see our staff back in the offices more often. I acknowledge and appreciate the work of our…of Mr. Armbruster to see that to happen. So, at this point, I would like to just put some faith and trust in our CAO, stand with him as he works to kind of get more people back to the office more often because he understands the nuances of whose contract is granted what as far as employees are concerned. And so, I won't be supporting this motion, though I appreciate the intent of it. I'm going to be supporting the work of our CAO at this time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker, through you to, well, I guess Council and the public. I think this direction is really heading into a wrong direction. I mean, telework allows us to save on greenhouse gas emissions from us not having to go to work, it is a benefit that doesn't cost the City anything, or barely anything, relative to the quality of life that some people

are looking for in their employment. If you think of people who have other…other commitments other than work; single parents, people who may be caregivers at home, there is a swath of the population that is instantly eliminated if we don't allow for flexible work arrangements. So, we are looking to make the best…deliver the best services for the money that we have to spend. This is one of those nonfinancial benefits that we can offer the collective bargaining units. Why would we take a tool away if it doesn't cost the City anything or barely anything? And why would want to encourage a practice that will result in more commutes to work, more cars on the street, more traffic congestion, challenges in achieving our climate goals of reducing single passenger automobile trips? I think it is going in the wrong direction. And I think the administration is best positioned and our collective bargaining units when we are looking to renew collective bargaining agreements to make these decisions. So, this yes/no motion I think would have been extremely problematic or would be extremely problematic if we were to vote straight up and down like zero or one. And I'd like to point out that many members of this Council have joined in this chamber, including some of those who were authors and or seconders of this motion. So, for telling everybody they should be restrained to a desk for the period of the workday, maybe we should have the same standards for ourselves. Thanks.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, I'm going to support what the Mayor said today, but not for the same...well, the same reasons, actually, but on the other side. I believe that the CAO has come to a compromise within our system. We know it is not that many employees that are working from home, but we do know there are some. There is a flexibility in the letter I…we received from the CAO. My…if I had my druthers, I would prefer to have less staff here. I'd like to sell some of these old buildings so we can get to…so we can get some money. But again, I understand this is one of those...I'm not sure if it's a debate, but we're not the only ones having this debate right now. It's all over the place. We see what happened to the Federal Government when they did that. Well, he wasn't too keen on that and they didn't have any space for all these people. Again, ideology won out. I have to…people have to because they are at work, then they are working and we can make sure they are. We don't know. We don't stand behind their computer to see if they're playing Minecraft or anything like that. We try to get them to be outcome based. Now, again, and I've had this debate with other people. What…coming to work really is important and maybe one day I'm with Councillor Allard, we can transform our systems. We need to get people together so they can share ideas, they can develop camaraderie, they can know each other. That is very important. Does that mean you have to be in your butt…butt on seats three days a week? That's just an arbitrary thing. I think our systems need to create that environment. And if we're going to have all these people coming downtown all of the time, maybe we could use one of our buildings for these type of conversations. There's some really neat models in the States where they do that. So, again, I understand the debate. If they're in their seats, we know they are being productive. Well, that is fallacy. We know that. We…it's the outcomes that they produce. So, there are some jobs, really, where you can produce it…you can produce the outcomes at home probably better than you could at the work environment where you are constantly getting disrupted by Joe who wants to talk about his night last night. Again, but that's also a sense of the camaraderie that you develop with that team…the team building. So, we actually know the City of Winnipeg, we are hurting hiring people. We are, we just know that. I met with the auditor…I met with departments…some people working in the department, I won't say which one, last night. And they are saying they have out of 25 people, they have 15 outstanding jobs. They just…people…the people come, they get hired with us for a bit and then they leave because the other work environment is better over there. They are mobile. People are mobile right now. So, again, I would prefer to have maybe less days that they have to be back at work or no days. But again, I also understand I don't think the world is ready for that yet and that's okay. Three days a week was a fair compromise. But again, because it includes the flexibility for those jobs that can work it. But again, so I am supporting, I am with the Mayor on this one. It's backing the CAO. He found a middle ground somewhere. We'll make Councillor Wyatt probably happy, won't make me that happy, but it's a fair balance between both sides. But I think we still need to foster an environment where we do have that collaboration. Where we do have people getting together to speak about issues, to get to know about their kids and so they have a sense of family. Because that's really…we come to do our job and many of our employees come to do the job because they believe in the Public Service, they believe in the City of Winnipeg. But we also have to make it so the job is flexible enough so they also believe in their families. Someone living in Transcona, they're coming in for a big hike if they have to come all the way downtown all the time. That's true. How much hours a day are they wasting in a car getting downtown where they could be with their family. Again, outcome-based measures rather than one, two, three, four people are sitting in their seat today, that's good. That's not the way we should be going forward. But again, that transformation won't happen overnight. So, again, I'm going to support the CAO. I think he's made a decent compromise. Like I said, I wish it was a little more flexible, but I think I will land in the middle on this one and support…not supporting this motion. This is a…I'm not…it was…Councillor Wyatt, to his credit, did ask me about it. And I just told him, I'm not there. I don't believe the 1940s style of work is still dominant. We should be looking at flexibility. We have technology now. We have that ability, but I understand where he's coming from. The idea…and he says in one of his lines here, the…well, inefficient to taxpayers, no. About camaraderie. That's what we do have to foster a sense of. So people have a sense of pride of working for the City of Winnipeg. You are not going to do that at home by yourself. So, I agree with that, we have to bring people back so they have that sense of pride. But to say you have to be sitting in your seat doing this work while easily I could do it somewhere else, to me, it's going to be restrictive on how we're going to be able to recruit people going forward. So, again, I'm not

going to support the motion. And I do…I'll stand up and say I do support, for now, the CAO's position on how they're going to manage the workforce. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: As you will hear later in the debate today, one of the factor that tipped the cost benefit analysis on Kenaston to favourable was the attribution of the social benefit from reduction in carbon tonnage and carbon emissions. We also have had a report here in recent months that indicated the amount of carbon reduction based on having a work at home policy. It's Councillor Allard's point, basically, with more data. Basically, we are saving half as much in just letting people work at home somewhat as we would for the 100 million plus expansion of Kenaston. And to that, we put a value, a social benefit, that we'll see later today. So, if we're being consistent, we have to recognize there's a social benefit with quite a bit of money from having a work at home policy. So, I will not be supporting the motion. Councillor Allard's made the general point already. But I want to tack on what he said that there are some environmental advantages to the arrangements we have had in place.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Wyatt to close, yes.

Councillor Wyatt: I think I will speak to it. Well, this is classic center, center, left, Madam Speaker. I just…could you have timed it better right after the vote on the living wage and we now have this discussion. And this is a classical example of the center, center, left speaking from both sides of their mouth at the same time. We want everybody to have a living wage, but they don't have to go to work. Now, that is classic, Madam Speaker. They don't have to go to the office to go to work. No, I get to speak, Mr. Chair…Madam Speaker. It is my turn to speak. You may not like me being direct as I am, but it's a classic two sides of the mouth at the same time by the…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, let's keep our…let's keep our comments respectful.

Councillor Eadie: You need the vote of other councillors around the table, which is not allowed under our rules.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, let's keep respect and decorum in the chamber. Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: But I would just say this, the next motion coming forward from maybe possibly from myself or somebody else or maybe even a member of EPC should be what's called the office space rationalization initiative. Because frankly, we don't need probably a third of the office space we have now in the downtown. And some of it leased, some of it extremely expensive, square footage office space that we have. If people are able to work three days a week, you could stagger that amongst the employees in the office, you don't need as much space, you don't need as many desks, you don't need as much square footage. I fully expect that to be the next initiative coming forward in light of the fact that we have endorsed this policy and we've agreed to this. This also removes some of the (inaudible) by the way, towards the City being able to make some decisions financially. I'm thinking of the budget boss over there and members of EPC who have to present the budget to us. You know…you know, if folks are working from home and we don't really know about the productivity there. I mean, the idea at one time, we had Film in Fridays, you remember many years ago. If we ever have to make steps to reduce our ability to serve or perform services, that kind of goes out the window here, doesn't it, to a certain degree? The idea of training and succession planning, that's one thing that Councillor Orlikow and I agree on. That, to me, right now, our succession planning from staff person to staff person, you know, Harry Lazarenko used to say to me, you know, Councillor Wyatt, you think you are…you think you are indispensable, well, just put your finger in a bucket of water and take it out and leave it to see the impression you've left behind, right. Now, he used to say that jokingly, but it's interesting though, over the years, actually, I think Harry…not about myself, but Harry was actually somewhat wrong, because I have seen the change, unfortunately, which has occurred where we have had senior people who have extremely…who are extremely knowledgeable and people who have been with the City a long time who are very competent. Who are able to make decisions and not have to second guess themselves. And they are gone and they did not pass that wisdom. For whatever reason, succession planning was not done. That information and wisdom was not passed on to new staff coming up. Sometimes we have major breaks in terms of that staffing, in terms of the…even people taking over the actual work that was done previously. And I can think of one area in particular and that's…I think we are getting better now at it, but at one point, we were in real trouble and that's the Land Development Branch of the City. The sandy arm that only feeds us. And we lost people like Ernie Carriere and others and we…you know, we struggled there for a while. And you know, that comes by being in the office. That comes by working together. And yes, you know, Madam Speaker, I am real...no, I'm not 19…some people say, well this is 19th century. No, look, we need mental…you know, there's mental health days. Our employers, and namely our supervisors and managers, I know are very flexible and have worked with staff to overcome issues where they have a personal loss in their family or they got a situation with their child. We have done that over and over and over again as an employer. And it's outside of sometimes…most often outside of the contract but we do it because we know it is right to help our employees. The reality is, Madam Speaker, it has to be a give and take on both sides. And we still have productivity issues in this city. We are debating all these issues right now,

we need to send a message, I think, as other employers have done, to come back to the office and start to address these issues. One in particular, one department…I can tell you right now, I hear from the private sector all the time: Permits Division. Go down and shoot a canon, you're not hitting anybody down in that office right now. And how many weeks does it now take to get a permit issued? Not weeks, pardon me, months. Okay, now I can't say that for sure that's linked to people being in the office or not, but you know, I…the public thinks so right now because they are not able to get the permits like they once did. Never mind trying to pull a development…a subdivision rezoning application through the system within a timely manner. These are issues that are related to…directly to productivity. And if you ask the private sector why have they elected to do this? Why did the Bank of Nova Scotia, a year ago December say, everybody back to the office. 300 or some folks didn't and they terminated their positions. I am not saying we do that, but that is what the Bank of Nova Scotia did and other banks followed. There was obviously a reason, it has to do with productivity. And Madam Speaker, I hear what Councillor Allard is saying about greenhouse gases, everything else. That is why we've got to build rapid transit. That's why we've got to build alternatives. I am on the same page as Councillor Allard. But to abandon the downtown and to say, well, we had a strategy of creating a campus plan around the City of Winnipeg…around city hall here. We had Planning Department south there on Assiniboine…north of Assiniboine, south of Broadway. We have…we have the Assessment Department over here at Confederation Building. We have the Winnipeg Police headquarters. We spent 300 and some million on that facility. You know, we've spent huge dollars and we've spent significant dollars on annual leasing costs, Madam Speaker and I don't know if we are getting value for money or not because of the fact that we're not prepared to say the pandemic is over and it's time to get on to providing services to the citizens of Winnipeg. And to answer Councillor Allard's question, you know, the fact of the matter is, we all…members of Council, I don't know about you, but just because it is 5:00, I don't stop. I still call people back. I still get e-mails. I still respond, go to events, meetings in the evening like we had last night for South Transcona's area structure plan that we're working on and every week. We continually go weekend, evenings, mornings. You know, we're not 9:00 to 5:00 punching the clock and none of us expected that and none of us are complaining about that. But I want to make that for the record, as well, because Councillor Allard took a bit of a shot at some of you guys in the room, I think. So, Madam Speaker, I would hope that this motion could be supported. And I will be calling a recorded vote. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on this notice of motion. All in favour? All in favour? Okay, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Chambers, Duncan, Schreyer, Wyatt.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Notice of motion is defeated. Next, onto another notice of motion moved by Councillor Wyatt. It's regarding parking and refreshments at city hall.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move referral of this matter. I was told by the Clerks that…to do this so that it could be referred to Governance. There was no other way to do it because of the procedures of Council right now. So, I'd like to move the matter be referred to Governance with the purpose of reporting back within 90 days.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so you're moving referral to Governance? We'll have a vote on that. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Councillor Eadie in opposition. Next…next notice of motion is council…is notice of motion on Council motion naming standards. Moved by Councillor Schreyer, second by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, I move referral to Governance, with instruction or without? Without instruction, therefore, no debate.

Madam Speaker: That's right. Councillor Schreyer is moving referral to Governance Committee. All in favour? Contrary? And that is carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: Now we have a Motion No. 3. Moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Mayes. It's regarding establishing a regulatory framework for water and sewer rates. It will be an automatic referral to the Executive Committee. That is just regular motion, it's not notice. Okay, so it will go to the EPC committee.

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Mayes,

WHEREAS the biggest sewage spill in the city's records occurred in September 2002, when a mechanical failure at the City of Winnipeg's North End Water Pollution Control Centre (NEWPCC) caused a spill into the Red River of 427 million litres of untreated sewage over a 57-hour period;

AND WHEREAS as a result of this disaster, upgrades to the treatment plant were originally called for by the provincial Clean Environment Commission in 2003, and were initially expected to be completed early in the 2010s;

AND WHEREAS the full project cost of the NEWPCC was originally estimated in 2015 to cost $795 million;

AND WHEREAS the rising costs of upgrades to the NEWPCC is currently estimated at $3 billion, an increase of more than $600 million over the most recent estimate of $2.38 billion;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has continually sought extensions on the timeline to complete the project with the most recent from 2030 to 2032;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has approved a four-year rate increase that would impact families by a price hike of more than 20% by 2027;

AND WHEREAS the Public Utilities Board of Manitoba (PUB) is an independent, quasi-judicial administrative tribunal that has broad oversight and supervisory powers over public utilities and designated monopolies, as set out in statute;

AND WHEREAS the PUB considers both the impact to customers and financial requirements of the utility in approving rates;

AND WHEREAS the PUB provides regulatory administration of the Municipal Act in all water and sewer utility rate regulation in every municipality except for the City of Winnipeg;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That City Council call upon the Province of Manitoba to establish a new regulatory framework to make Winnipeg's water and wastewater rates, and their annual changes, subject to the approval of the Public Utilities Board.*

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now move into by-laws, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Okay, thank you, Madam Speaker. I move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 115/2024, By-law No. 116/2024, By-law No. 117/2024, By-law No. 118/2024, By-law No. 119/2024, By-law No. 120/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 115/2024, By-law No. 116/2024, By-law No. 117/2024, By-law No. 118/2024, By-law No. 119/2024, By-law No. 120/2024.

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

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, second and third readings, please.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the…that By-law No. 99/2023 read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 99/2023.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that By-law No. 99/2023 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor, next section.

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. 114/2024, By-law No. 126/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried

Clerk: By-law No. 114/2024 and By-law No. 126/2024.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that By-law Nos. 114/2024 and 126/2024 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 114/2024.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, if we could be at our seat during the vote, please. Thank you.

Clerk: By-law No. 114/2024 and By-law No. 126/2024.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I move that the rule be suspended and By-law Nos. 114/2024 and 126/2024 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. We'll now have question period for the Mayor. Councillor Gilroy.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gilroy: I was wondering if the Mayor could provide us an update on any encampment funding.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, I thank Councillor Gilroy for the question about an update on encampment funding. The Federal Government, a little while ago, announced 250 million dollars for encampments to deal…help cities deal with encampments and to get more people out of encampments and into housing. The funding was conditional on provinces matching the Federal Government's funding. And the Federal Government indicated that any province that doesn't participate in the matching would be a province where the feds would bypass that province and deal directly with cities. I'm pleased to say that our Provincial Government is participating and has been, I know in discussion with our CAO, Jarred Baker from my office, and Chris Brens from the Public Service as well, as well as talking to frontline service agencies and the Federal Government. So, all that to say the Province right now is working on drawing down into

our city as much funding as possible. I commend them for that. We want to work collaboratively with that. There is a sense of urgency though, we all know winter's coming. And so, it's a little bit…a little frustrating that the money is not already here. But, again, our Province is working very actively to coordinate that and to get the money at work in the City of Winnipeg as quickly as possible. In the meantime, a reminder to everyone that we had an encampment…we have an encampment strategy, it's an encampment process map, is what it's called. And that was established under…during COVID. And of course during COVID, people couldn't be indoors. And so that's really, you know, what led to the need for an encampment process map and our current acting CAO Mr. Sherwood Armbruster is…has started a review of the current encampment steps and processes. We do this in coordination with City departments, Mr. Jarred Baker from my office is also part of that initial discussion with the CAO. And of course, the CAO is also working with the frontline agencies that are providing mobile outreach services and others. Our departments, like Police, Fire, Paramedic, and the Province also has a part to play. I can tell you we're…we're trying…we're making every effort to try to be in lockstep and work with the Province of Manitoba. I publicly commended Minister Bernadette Smith before, I'll do it here on the floor of Council again. She's very receptive, she's working very hard with her team to try to make sure that we have, with us and others, one coordinated approach to all things related to addressing homelessness, including encampments. So, it's a work-in-progress. I believe we're making progress. More to come. I think once our CAO, not to put him on the spot, but once our CAO, you know, has a bit of a…something to bring forward to us or at least to share with us, I think Council needs an opportunity to give some input to, ultimately, the City's encampment strategy because I know it's frustration, you know. It's in the news right now. Members of the public are very concerned with what they see in and around their community. They're concerned for individuals within the encampments and rightly so, they're concerned for their own property. We've got fires in encampments, we've got debris and garbage around encampments and so, the bottom line is this. We need to get people out of encampments, into housing, with wraparound supports. So, that continues to be our primary focus. But where there's safety issues in encampments, where there's fire issues in encampments, our Public Service needs to go in and do their work. If a vacate order needs to be brought forward and people need to be moved, then that's what should be done. But what we don't want to do is just be shuffling people from one neighborhood to another. We need housing for people and to get them out of the encampments and into housing with the supports that they need to keep them in housing, so. I want to thank the Councillor for the question. Lots going on, stay tuned, because as the CAO continues to work on the…an update to our policy, we really need to have…Council members give input on that. Thank you.

Councillor Gilroy: Follow up question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, will the Mayor look into more of a transition or shelter situation where it becomes more of a permanent place where people can leave their items, have a bed to call home, and we know that housing's going to take a long time to build, but we need a shelter system…

Madam Speaker: The question, Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Will the Mayor look at a shelter system that is less of a…on demand shelter system and more of a permanent home for these…for people?

Mayor Gillingham: Excuse me. I want to thank the Councillor for the question. I'll go back to my (inaudible) answer and go back to the comment about the City working in concert with the Province. So, to utilize some of those funds, we don't yet know the allocation and how those funds that would flow from the federal government would be used, but there's some…some work being done by Minister Smith's team to notionally determine how best to use those funds. If we can get…I'll speak for myself. If we can get people out of housing, and we don't have permanent housing for them yet, but we can get them out of…out of housing, pardon me, if we can get them out of encampments, and we don't have permanent housing for them yet, then if a transitional shelter is a stopgap before we can get them into housing, I'm in favour of that. In my mind, much, you know, probably for a lot of us here, much better that someone is off of a riverbank, out of a tent in a park, into a transitional shelter housing, than leaving them, you know, to…out in the elements. So, open to that discussion in concert with the Province of Manitoba for sure.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker, I rise and today's Winnipeg Free Press…Dan Lett's reporting and I want to give the benefit of the doubt to the City and the Mayor…was reporting that the City continues to offer few details to whether Mr. Sheegl has paid any of the money he owes to the City and he refers to the 1.1 million in costs and damages that were assigned by Chief Justice Glenn Joyal. As well as, he says a similar statement as well, the City is saying little as to whether Caspian Construction has repaid the 21.5 million as the agreement has indicated. I realize that I'm raising this now with the Mayor and if he needs to take it under advisement, I'd appreciate…that's fine. I just want to raise this because I…I

don't always…you know, I think healthy, you know, critical thinking…I'd like to know the facts, not necessarily facts given by the Winnipeg Free Press, so I just want to clarify the situation on this matter. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I want to thank the Councillor for the question. Yes, the courts did…you know, determine awards to the City of Winnipeg on the two matters the Councillor spoke about. I don't have the most recent information but that's something we'll certainly take under advisement and in fact, I will ask our Public Service to get an answer just to send a message and answer to all of Council once I have that information. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: In light of the recent revelations by Mr. Pearson in the court the other day…

Madam Speaker: A question, please.

Councillor Wyatt: Has the Mayor had any indication yet from the relatively new Premier, a year old, who made a promise in the last general election to hold a public inquiry into this matter, whether or not he is actually going to be live up to that commitment, I'm assuming he will. And question is, when is he going to announce the public inquiry into these matters?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I want to thank the Councillor for the question. I don't have an update from the Premier at this time on that.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, and Councillor Eadie, I have you on the list, thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Before we next meet here as Council, we will have the extraordinary experience on November 19th, the meeting to consider the malls and corridors proposals for zoning reform. I'm largely in support of that, but I continue to ask questions about one of the provisions, which is, really a question about you, Madam Speaker, in a way. Because you did a very good job when the mall at Northgate got developed and I remember you saying the line, what I got for the people was what they needed. We would all like to be able to say that to people in our neighborhoods. They will not be hearing this though in the future, it's as-of-right development subject to, we are told, standard development agreements. We seem to have sorted out the morass of whether we can impose these development agreements or not, we think. But we're being told it'll be the standard development agreement and then you ask and you're told, what does that mean? It's the standard one. So, what I want to ask the Mayor, frankly I'm…perhaps not as convinced that the…it's like a Soviet style model where you think that the Public Service is…the state is an extension of the people. We no longer need to listen to the councillors or to the people, we'll just have the state impose these development agreements. What would the people want though? To use your phrasing...

Madam Speaker: The question, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: How do we know that we're going to get what the people need in their neighborhoods. You had the vehicle to do that with the public hearing, so when can we find out what will be in these development agreements that are going to be standardized? Surely, we need to have that before the hearing on November 19th.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I believe…through you Madam Speaker, I believe in the Councillor's question he'd indicate he's tried to get this information from the Public Service and has not been successful. I just…I know I don't ask the question back but I'm going to base my answer on that assumption. I will seek to work with the Councillor to get information, hopefully before that time. If not, certainly as part of that process, but that will be the goal.

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

Councillor Mayes: Mr. Kelsey from the Mayor's Office has been very good indeed about talking about traffic studies and the need to have those and that is something that the public needs, as in your case up at Northgate, Madam Speaker. Can we have some assurance that Mr. Kelsey's work will have paid dividends and that part of these development agreements will be some…assurance that there's some sort of traffic study that will come.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I can assure you that I and my staff are working hard through this process as well, and I appreciate the Councillor's request, and we'll certainly take that under advisement as to say we're working hard to review all that is coming forward as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Schreyer and then Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. All sorts of big questions here, including questions about Public Works and stuff being asked to the Mayor, and that's fine. They're offered to answer them. In this case, I'm talking about something specifically that just happened regarding one of the report items to EPC. And I got a big question. And, given the Mayor does appoint to the Executive Policy Committee, questions of leadership and perspective here at City Hall, question is this, in the Mayor's perspective, is Council supreme? Or is Executive Policy Committee supreme? We just had a motion in which a Council-generated motion came back to Council. And we could not vote in favour of it, because apparently because of the recommendation by Executive Policy Committee. That means to me, that Council is not supreme. But we say all the time, Council is supreme, not Executive Policy Committee. And on that basis, how could we approve the supremacy of Council? On that motion on the…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, thank you for that. The clerks will have an explanation and the vote stands. Yeah, and that is our past process, it's our current process. There is nothing untoward during that vote. Mr. Mayor, if you wish to respond.

Mayor Gillingham: Yeah, just again, through you Madam Speaker, we're looking to the clerks. And as you indicated, there will be…if the Councillor needs further information, ultimately…the motion was brought forward, the motion was amended, as for the process, we had the votes accordingly, and the results are what they are.

Madam Speaker: Next question is by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise, Madam Speaker, through you to the Mayor. Recently, we heard that Mr. Lloyd Schreyer has been appointed to a two-year committee study…pardon me? Lloyd. Oh…okay. Sorry, Madam Speaker, I apologize. Anyway. We heard about the rail study commission headed up by the former member of Parliament…Lloyd Axworthy. Anyway, we heard about a two-year study, Madam Speaker, and the Mayor was on the radio but that two-year commission, which is being established by and funded through the Premier and the Government of Manitoba, Madam Speaker, the people behind it constantly called for not doing anything with the Arlington Bridge until this study's done, and I just want to confirm, Madam Speaker, that…is it the Mayor's position that we don't do anything towards replacing the Arlington Bridge until they come back with a study that's already been done in the past, and I don't know that…if it has a change, it's going to take a long time. We need the bridge. So, is it the Mayor's position that we don't do anything with that Arlington Bridge until that committee comes back with their study?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm trying to imagine if Edward Schreyer and Loyd Axworthy were one person right now. But the answer to the Councillor's question specifically is, no, I believe that we are going to have to make a decision on the Arlington Bridge prior to that…to your study being completed on the assumption that there will be a report back on the Arlington Bridge, I think within the…I'm quite certain within the two year timeline. So, that will come to Council prior to, you know, before 24 months from now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I was told that there was a report ready to come in October, it was delayed. Is the Mayor saying that he's being told otherwise that we're going to have to wait 10 or 12 months before that report about replacing the Arlington Bridge comes forward?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Through you, Madam Speaker, no I am not saying that.

Madam Speaker: Final question…

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, without preamble, will the Mayor be asking the negotiators to set a criteria in negotiations to have a living wage paid to our City workers, especially in the CUPE bargaining unit?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I'll take that under advisement, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Yes, Councillor…

Councillor Schreyer: Just for clarification, so there's no misunderstanding. Lloyd Schreyer's a real person, he's his own person, he's our cousin, and he's done some great work on behalf of the Province of Manitoba, especially when it comes to labor relations. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for that.

Councillor Eadie: I should have made that point of order. Actually, Lloyd Schreyer is a big-time supporter of mine over the years. And I…I always say…when I think of Lloyd, I… but, you know, I know Lloyd Axworthy, too, right.

Madam Speaker: He's a real person, thank you for that. Thank you. Councillor Santos, and then Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Santos: Thank you. I got a couple of residents that continue to follow up with my office with respect to a lot of properties that there's demo debris still being left around and it's been around for several, several months. So, I'm hoping if the Mayor has any updates on how we can fast-track issuing demo permits and get the debris moved quickly and out of these communities.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I want to thank Councillor Santos for the question, and she…I appreciate that she did just send to me the addresses of the properties in question, where they're having trouble getting their demo permits. I mean, one of the decisions this Council made quite some time ago, which I absolutely support, is making it easier for property owners to demolish their buildings where that is required and necessary. So, I certainly don't want demolition permits stuck, and so, I'm glad to certainly work with the Councillor and others that may need to try to find ways with their department to see why those may be stuck or those demo permits have not been issued to this point. And I want to recognize, once again, that it is really, you know, Madam Speaker, Councillor Eadie's ward, Councillor Santos' ward, Councillor Gilroy's ward, primarily, it seems, where the bulk of these properties seem to be, and where these residents living in the neighborhood, too often, unfairly, have to look at these piles of rubble, or these vacant and boarded-up buildings. And so, absolutely willing to work with the Councillors, any Councillors, if need be, to try to see why demolition permits are being held up. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, second round.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I won't do too much of a preamble. This is just kind of a heads-up, Madam Speaker. The CPKC Winnipeg Beach rail line…I think it does have one customer which is the City of Winnipeg, but they are building a solar plant up in Selkirk, Manitoba, and that Winnipeg Beach line used to provide service and I think still does provide service to the…there's a Selkirk steel mill or some sort of metalworks out there, I'm not sure, they still might be a customer. But, Madam Speaker, there is a cost, and I'm just wondering, and the Mayor or whoever's the Chair of Water and Waste, Madam Speaker should find out, the amount of chemicals and things that we need for processing the sewage at what is momentarily called the North End Sewage Plant, but it's North Winnipeg Sewage Plant. There's a huge amount that gets transported by rail, which is way cheaper by truck, and I'm wondering if the Water and Waste has looked at, what would it cost for them to actually truck in all those chemicals, and what the added cost to already a very expensive facility.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Eadie is right, really on that line there is one customer, it is the City of Winnipeg North End…North Winnipeg, I will say, Water Pollution Control Centre. I'm hoping, I'm very hopeful that Dr. Axworthy, in his analysis, will consider that line and other lines like it where there's maybe only one or perhaps no customers, where it's under-utilized, as part of the analysis as to whether or not those could be starting points, a real…relocation or decommissioning some of those lines. But the Councillor's right. To do that, would require that the City of Winnipeg could calculate the cost and the financial implications and...of changing the way that we receive the chemicals needed to do the work of the plant. That rail line, if I understand it right, is approximately 9 kilometres long, it crosses 30 intersections or there's 30 street crossings in North Winnipeg in residential areas, and so you just imagine. If we could come to the place, where it made sense to, and it was financially viable to, remove a rail line and remove the potential for rail-pedestrian, rail-vehicle collisions in 30 intersections. It would make that section of our city much safer. So, very open to that, but again to the Councillor's point, he's correct. The analysis, the financial impact of finding another way to get that product to the North End plant would be something that would be required as part of the analysis.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I don't know if the Mayor's aware, but in your ward Madam Speaker, I'm wondering, why aren't we looking at the Arborg line that goes through and crosses through as many neighborhoods through the Point Douglas and Old Kildonan wards.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I have a call scheduled, or I'm scheduling a call, we're playing a bit of phone tag between myself and Dr. Axworthy, so, I will just…in my call with him, just look at the scope of his work. I believe it's all rail lines in Winnipeg, but certainly, I hope that it is, but I appreciate the Councillor raising that potential line as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, final question.

Councillor Eadie: Third and final question, Madam Speaker. What was it…oh. How has the Mayor been confirmed that there's only one customer left on the Winnipeg Beach line which goes all the way out to Selkirk, Manitoba, where they're building a new solar plant and they're going to have to move all that…those solar panels somewhere across the country for sale. And the…also the Rolling Mills or whatever it's called in Selkirk, Manitoba. How, where is the Mayor actually getting specific confirmation, is it from KC…CPKC or is it only from Mr., or Dr. Axworthy, that…that detail is coming from?

Mayor Gillingham: I thank the Councillor for his question. I should clarify, I believe it is...there's only one customer in Winnipeg for that rail line. And so, the Councillor makes a good point about other customers north of the City of Winnipeg. I will get, obviously, as part of the analysis, we'll get confirmation to see if, somehow, we're missing that there's some other customer in Winnipeg. Nonetheless, this analysis is something that I look forward to. It's important to the Premier, it's part of my campaign commitment as well to take a look at where we may be able to rationalize, decommission some rail lines within the City of Winnipeg as a first start and turn them into spaces…land that could be redeveloped into housing or some other use. Active transportation pathways, green space, whatever the case may be.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Just on the issue of the railway relocation matter. Is the Mayor aware that a gentleman by the name of Art DeFehr who was actually commissioned by, at the time, Minister Emerson, to look at inland ports. And I had the opportunity to meet with Mr. DeFehr who was quite eloquent on the matter, and indicated to me, that one of the lowest hanging fruits that we could actually pick from the tree…so to speak on this issue, and implement, if the Mayor, if the Premier, and the Prime Minister were prepared to put the executives of both CN and CP in a room, and tell them how it's going to be, that, through the Fraser River Valley, there's actually one rail line on one side of the river because it's such a gorge, they couldn't put two, and CN is on one side of the river, on the other side is the CP line. And for literally, dozens and dozens of kilometres, they share their lines. So in other words, they work together to cooperatively move trains on each other's lines, one in one direction, one in the other. And yet, through the City of Winnipeg, the same exists, except we actually have two sets of rail lines with two sets of tracks each. And yet, they could share the most direct line in and out of the city, is the CPR main line...

Madam Speaker: A question, please.

Councillor Wyatt: …with the most grade separations. The one that would prevent and address issues like Councillor Duncan has in his ward, and others, is to get CN and CP working together to run the rail through the city on one line, which is what Mr. DeFehr strongly recommended at the time, instead of spending hundreds of million dollars of grade separations on two separate sets of line. Get them working on one line, which would be the CPR line going through the city back and forth. Put the executives in the room. Is he aware of this that this option has been there for some time, and they can do it already, and they do it already, and have done it for decades…longer than that, on the Fraser River Gorge going down to Vancouver.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I want to thank the Councillor for his comments. My…I obviously can't speak for Dr. Axworthy. My strong assumption would be that, certainly Dr. Axworthy is and will be aware of previous studies that have been done, including the work done by Mr. DeFehr and others. And I'm hoping, believing that kind of previous work will be taken into consideration rather than starting from scratch. Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: To the same matter, is the Mayor aware that CN executives have expressed to members of Council in the past to…as per Councillor Eadie's comment, that the spur lines are the lines that are actually the most effective or easily relocated. It involves creating a spur outside the city to run them off the main lines south. So for example, the

Emerson subdivision. The Letellier subdivision, the one that Councillor Eadie just referred to. And you know it, that these are the subdivisions that…rail subdivisions, that could actually be moved relatively easier than moving a main line.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, through you Madam Speaker, I am and really…the Councillor from Transcona is going to hit upon what I think, probably a lot of us think, could be the incremental…the low hanging fruit, and start with some of these places that…spur lines that are maybe under-utilized that could be built elsewhere, accommodated for, compared to moving all of the, you know, the big yards that we have in the city. We could start small and have proof of concept, but, again, that's all to be analyzed in the work that Lloyd Axworthy is doing, and we're looking forward to the outcome of that work. And hopefully, I'm frankly hoping that we as, you know, certainly, I as Mayor, and we as Council have opportunity to speak to it. I think, you know, Councillor Orlikow here, for example, you know, had a line going through his area there and now there's…some of those spaces are some nice housing there, so. Anyways, so, this is more, you know, I think there's opportunity here for us…all of us, and I hope that there's an opportunity, frankly, for Council to have some input on this analysis.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, final question.

Councillor Wyatt: The final question is, is the Mayor aware that on the UN paper of parliament, prior to the fall of the Paul Martin government, legislation was actually written and prepared for the House to vote on that would've given municipalities across Canada the first right of refusal on surplus or abandoned railway line corridors, and that that legislation, already written, could easily be brought back into the House of Commons.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, thank you. I either did not know or best did not remember. I think it was the former. I don't think I knew that information, so I thank the Councillor for that information.

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

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DATED OCTOBER 10, 2024

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of October 10th and move Item 1 as consent.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, standing it down?

Councillor Mayes: Yeah.

Madam Speaker: Okay, alright. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 - Entertainment Funding Tax Annual Report - 2023

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. I will wait for my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Councillor Browaty has, to his credit, in the past questioned why we continue to have this tax given that we rebate virtually all of it to three of the major players. So, I guess, if he can speak to two points: any progress on that? Because it does artificially inflate the grant totals that we have by tens of million…at least 10 million dollars. Additionally, I assume the True North agreement, the rule is, venues over 5,000. The Seabears, obviously, playing in a venue of over 5,000. I assume whatever agreement we have with True North that was negotiated with the Jets sweeps that in as well. May need to take that…I will be impressed if you know that off the top of your head, frankly, Councillor

Browaty. But two things is that: are we collecting or rebating with the Seabears and any progress on simply phasing this tax out since we seem to…we do make a little net, but we don't make much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I'd like to thank my colleague for the question. Through you to my colleague, the entertainment funding tax under previous administration really did just become a movie theater tax. At this point, there really is not anything that does not get refunded back. I think it is even by venue so anything that happens at the…at the arena, including concerts…

Madam Speaker: Just a moment, Mr. Chair. This is not question period. We…there wasn't…

Councillor Browaty: Oh yeah. Thanks. Sorry.

Madam Speaker: I know, there has been a lot. It's okay. I was talking with the Clerk as well at the moment. So, Councillor Wyatt wants to speak to the item. And we'll certainly come back to you.

Councillor Wyatt: Although, I was enjoying the answer, but it really…I was…I would say, you know, that happens to any…that happens to all of us, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Well, none of you said anything, by the way. So, go ahead.

Councillor Wyatt: Absolutely. Absolutely. True North…I guess I stood this…Councillor Mayes stood this down. And I'm thankful for him doing that. I think the key thing here in my mind on this report is just to highlight a couple things that, you know, it's kind of like the truth that dare not speak its name at times, things that aren't here. And because it involves a certain party that is kind of equivalent of his Kingship. But anyway, the True North facility and the folks that have done a lot of great things for Winnipeg by bringing the Jets back. But I want to put on the record that when we decided to do the entertainment tax refund to the Winnipeg…it wasn't the Winnipeg Jets at the time, it was the Manitoba Moose. That was the decision at that time. And that doesn't seem to have been put into…put on the table. I note in the report that their arrangement with us expires in 2029, which is really not that far away. When you think about often they will approach us a few years in advance to start renegotiating the terms of the contract or to verify it. I would hate to see something being walked on last minute prior to an election or right thereafter on that. But that the True North contract, it should…there should be an arrangement, I would think, that there should be a negotiation to the terms better to the city that we have now in terms of refunding the entertainment tax in light of the fact that this was done with the Manitoba Moose, not for a professional hockey team, number one. Number two, following the decision by the City to refund entertainment tax, the True North received from the Province of Manitoba a casino license to operate their own casino in downtown Winnipeg called the Shark Club. There's not many people who get a sole-source casino license, but they did. Congratulations to them. And that's a direct revenue source to them that was not on the table when we decided to refund the entertainment tax and looking at their business plan at the time. It was not. And number three, the decision was made by the Province of Manitoba to give sole-source and to give 12 million dollars to their fourplex expansion in Headingley, or next to Headingley, which cost, at the time, about 20 million dollars to build a fourplex or 25 million. And 12 million of which came from the Province of Manitoba awarded without any tender directly. Could you imagine if we did that as a city, what would happen to us in the…with the media. But Premier Doer was able to do it and nobody questioned any of that. And this was leading up to the return of the Winnipeg Jets, by the way. That was prior to. So, these are factors, Madam Speaker, that I think work in our favour when it comes to the existing…with the planned or the future renegotiation of this contract with True North. I hope that these matters are taken in consideration and that, indeed, we may need to refund part of it, but we maybe don't have to refund all of it. And either that or a phased-in approach to reducing the actual refund itself so that it could be budgeted for by the professional hockey team in the city of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Councillor Chambers: Point of order, Madam Speaker. For the record, the Manitoba Moose are a professional hockey team.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Okay.

Councillor Chambers: And a professional hockey team.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Browaty, you may now close.

Councillor Browaty: My apologies for the response there.

Madam Speaker: That's okay, I didn't stop you either.

Councillor Browaty: Again, this…the entertainment funding tax over the years has basically transformed into a movie theatre tax. I mean, some could argue that, you know, the price of a movie ticket and the accessibility to movies are a lot more accessible than professional hockey tickets and why are we taxing those, but that is a debate, perhaps, for another day. Again, Winnipeg definitely needs our revenue sources right now. And again, that tax remains at the moment. Again, I am just going to say that, do we need to continue to have tax on the professional sports organizations? And that's certainly a discussion that could be had in the future. I do know things like the Concert Hall, Matt Works included a number of years ago. At one point, he said, traveling shows got the entertainment funding tax on them, but local shows did not. It got simplified, I think, during my time on Council and that is no longer the case. It is interesting, you know, even though movie theater tickets have gone up in price, the revenue being brought in is pretty comparable. I think the way they are getting around that, perhaps, a little bit is there's a base fee for a movie ticket and now there's all sorts of surcharges. Apparently, in recent years now, they have assigned seating in movie theatres. You have online bookings. And all these things have additional charges above and beyond the ticket price. And apparently, those ancillary fees are not subject to the City of Winnipeg entertainment tax. So, anyways, I move this report today and I thank you.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of Item 1? Contrary? That is carried. We will now move into question period under this committee. Any questions for our Chair? Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: I had asked at the last Council meeting to the Mayor about the unfortunate mess of the 911 fee that…where the revenue has been booked in to the budget, but we have no revenue. As Marty Morantz once said, it's easy to balance the budget if you can just make up the revenue numbers. It…something has gone wrong. The Mayor's office staff have talked to me and found fault with the Civil Service, the Civil Service unfortunately, has found fault with the Mayor's office, maybe it's the Province's fault, I don't know. To the credit of Ms. Watt, she talked to me about…I'd asked last time for documents, she had indicated at some point, she did not give a date, at some point a By-law would be coming. We continue to fall short of revenue by, I'm not sure how much, hundreds of thousands per month. Digging a hole into the budget would be useful to have this revenue if only for the rainy day fund, so can Councillor Browaty update us on when we might actually get the By-law, I understand there's a federal aspect, I understand there's a provincial aspect. In fact, that seems to have been in the drafting of the budget. They always thought that this was nailed down with the Province, clearly it wasn't. Someone has…someone has aired here, I don't know, I don't know if we'll found out who, but…

Madam Speaker: Question, please.

Councillor Mayes: Can Councillor Browaty update us on when we might get this By-law? I thought it'll be coming today but when might we get the By-law from the staff and start actually getting some revenue on this?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Through you to my colleague, we…I guess perhaps, this is a new ground for us. Did inquire a By-law from us before the Province could approve it. That By-law is still forthcoming. I'm hoping it's going to be here sooner than later, but I will get an update for the Councillor as soon as possible.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, next is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Duncan will step in for chair, Councillor Rollins.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED OCTOBER 3, 2024

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would introduce the report of October 3rd and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 through 6.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Okay, Item 6. I will call the question on Items 1 through 5. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Mr. Chair, Item 6.

Item 6 - Subdivision and Rezoning - Southwest Dawson Road South at Plessis Road, Precinct J - DASZ 12/2024

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much. I will hear from my Council colleague.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker, I stand this down because I am quite concerned about what I've read here with what happened at…and I want to…at Property and Development. And I realize the chair is not here. But I can tell you, Madam Speaker, this was a matter that dealt with…was dealt with at three public hearings at the standing…at the community committee where the community committee went into great detail. This is a major housing development spearheaded by Qualico inside the ward of Transcona. There was a lot of issues that we had to deal with in terms of the housing development. There's new developments that are happening beside it that have already been approved by this Council in a development to the north of this site. There is another major 222 unit that we approved as well to the northwest of this site. But this is a major development and a major new subdivision. And we thought we had an agreement at community committee. We worked extremely cooperatively with Qualico only to read now major changes to what we had voted on at the community committee now being rescinded, cut out of the report. And I don't think this was anything being done politically or politically motivated in any way, shape or form at the standing committee. I think this is being…this is coming right through from our administration. I don't know what is going on there in terms of relationship. I'm not going to skew that or create a cloud over that between Qualico and members of our administration, but I can tell you right now, that it does appear that one company has a bit more authority through the back room than other developers may not have the same kind of leeway. And I can tell you that some of the conditions that have been removed are really concerning. And I would hope that this matter could be referred back and that a discussion could be had with…I would be happy to meet with the chair about this. I was given no heads up by this by the Public Service only on one inconsequential matter where they did give me heads up that this was going to be changed, but they did not inform me of all the other changes that they were going to be coming forward with that have now been recommended. And I realize as well that often these come through the standing committee. EPC sees them and simply just endorses based on the standing committee's decision and really doesn't get into the weeds of the matter. But I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that we did get into the weeds of this matter. We got…and I can give you the examples, which I will do now. And that is namely, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, just before you do that, I just want to remind everyone that moving referral, you've already spoken.

Councillor Wyatt: I know I can't. And that's why I'm encouraging a member of…of any of this chamber to do so, but I would like to say some points on the record before that's done. I would just like to say that we worked very hard not to place any kind of new conditions.

Councillor Schreyer: Point of information, Madam Speaker. He may still speak if he offers instruction to the referral?

Councillor Wyatt: No, I can't move referral now.

Councillor Schreyer: Oh, because he already spoke.

Madam Speaker: He is not offering instructions, just continuing his speaking time.

Councillor Wyatt: So, I will start out by saying that a clause that was deleted in the agreement and it was, I think, at the end of the day, Qualico walked out of the room, they were pleased. At least, that's what they indicated to me. But then to see the major changes that occurred, clearly, they wanted to get even a further, better arrangement with the City, which causes me concern. Number one, we have now coming before our community committees a generic clause out of Water and Waste which we had never seen before, basically stating that the proposed development currently has added…that Water and Waste is throwing it back onto the developer to determine whether or not capacity is there. In other words, they are saying, we will approve your development today, however, when the time comes to issue permits, you may not have capacity. So, in other words, Water and Waste is saying, we're going to approve it, but we are not approving it. And in my belief, Council is the final authority on the matter if we are approving it here, then we are approving it. And the issue of Water and Waste…Water and Waste shouldn't be different than any other department, Madam Speaker. We have what's called the ACG report, which is the Administrative Coordinating Group, where every department gets to weigh in with their issues and concerns and they get to speak to them and they have them addressed or they have them not addressed. But nevertheless, they're addressed in advance. Water and Waste is the only department of the City, that I'm aware of, that comes back and says, no, we have the authority and the ability to deny their ability to pull a permit even though you have

approved a subdivision application at City Council. And so, they have thrown the onus and now they've developed a clause which was new at the hearing body. We have never seen this clause before coming forward. And so, we put a condition on it saying that, no, we threw it back…that Water and Waste, it's incumbent on them to notify the applicant in advance if there's a capacity issue. That clause is being struck out. Their clause is staying. Everybody this morning spoke very highly of Councillor…former Councillor Vandal, Minister Vandal, and rightfully so. Minister Vandal, when he was Councillor Vandal for this area, approved a subdivision just to the north, A&S, and he placed an area charge on it, which, a very reasonable area charge, mind you. That the area be…pay funds towards Winakwa Community Club and expansions and improvements at that community club. A&S felt it was fair and I thought it was fair as well at the Qualico subdivision which is right beside their subdivision, building the same kind of subdivision, should be subject to the same area charge. That would have been 409,000 dollars, by the way, spread out over 1,600 to 1,800 homes, much of it multiple-family. The amount per square foot or per acreage is next to nothing. But no, all of a sudden, that clause gets deleted at the standing committee even though this Council has approved the same area charge on the very same development, right? Right next door. So, in other words, we have one rule for one developer and one for the big guy. And we know who the big guy is out on the block, right? And there's nothing wrong with big guys. I go forward, Madam Speaker, the changes…further changes that were made to the agreement where clauses were deleted completely out of the package whereby this community committee decided to eliminate the requirement for part of Dawson Road to be paved. And part of that is to…what I try to look at is old gravel roads in my ward that could be decommissioned that don't need to be built and that that could be offset in terms of AT. It's not a benefit to the developer, because there's other costs that we find where they can make the investments into the neighbourhood that they are building. But that this is a liability where we don't have to have a road in the future that we then have to maintain which we know what our challenges are there. A section of Dawson Road from the entranceway going east does not need to be in place. As a matter of fact, Plessis Road, at the northern end of Plessis Road, has been decommissioned. It is actually dead end now at Fermor. There's no reason to have Dawson going through all the way to be built as a road standard. And we saw that…but Public Works, for whatever reason, still thinks, well, we want to keep that as an option. Yet, we know as fact from our own Transportation Master Plan that we passed in 2011, that the future Abinojii Mikanah would be continuing on through and connecting to Fermor. Why do we need this section of Dawson Road here still connecting through? Part of it still does need to be built to service the A&S development and to connect through to that. But the section to the east doesn't have. This is the detail that we got into, but all of sudden, that's changed. Another part of the report that got changed at P&D was the requirement by the community committee suggests that in…we were trying to be…in the spirit of Welcoming Winnipeg, is that to encourage park names and street names to be of an Indigenous origin. That's now been removed. I don't understand that. I thought that was something we want to encourage and struck out of the agreement. Another part which will be very interesting to those who are in…who are very supportive of the need to encourage affordable housing was we tried to move a motion to say that we should be encouraging the developer to make application at H&M. We moved a motion to encourage, not to require, to work with the developer to try to find funding for trees to go above and beyond in the parks. For other levels of government to participate. Very…not a motion that would actually force the developer to do that. Not a motion to force the City to do anything. But rather, to do exactly like the Mayor wants to say.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Which is every member of Council campaigned on one this which was actually forestry and trees, all of that...a sudden that intent is gone. And finally, one of the major clauses that was deleted…and this has to do with phasing, Madam Speaker. So, just to explain quickly, developers like to phase their developments. And this is a big development. The issue we have, is…has to do with us providing the services. So, us being able to go in and provide a transit service in a timely manner. So, what we have to do is we have to have a loop in the development then back out, it's not ideal for our Transit Department. So, we're saying, look at, stick to your phasing. We specified a phasing that they can't step out. If they step out of it, they've got to go to community committee. By the way, we used to be able to…we did that all the time. Qualico tried to step out of their phasing in Canterbury Park in Transcona and we said, no, you're not going to do that. And by the way, you're going to punch Ravenhurst through and you're going to do it now. If you want to step out of the phasing, we are able to do that and make it happen in a timely manner. And that actually facilitated Qualico's development in the area to take out…take off. They didn't be realize that Ravenhurst was such a key connection to them. But nonetheless, those are…that is an example of why the phasing and having it in there is important. Now, I know Qualico…that's one part Qualico did not want, I can say that. All the other issues were not an issue for them, at least I didn't think so. But that was something that they did not want and I said, no, you have been required to come forward with your phasing in the past. And we understand that you can't build everything at once that's why you have phasing. We understand you've got to break it up. I understand that. And you know, it's tied to the economy. Housing may drop. They can't go forward to the next phase. We understand that. I'm not saying that we force them to build a phasing, but rather, the time…the order of the phasing, they just can't jump around the development as they stay fit. Stick to your plan to help us bring in services timely. I would appreciate that the work going on at the standing…at the community committee was serious, it was lengthy. This was a meeting that was a…like, the meetings we went through were extensive. I can tell you that we do have…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, thank you. That concludes your speaking time.

Councillor Wyatt: I could just one…30 seconds? We do have 50 names of people who have registered. We now have…they have the ability to take this matter to the Municipal Board. I hope that this doesn't have to happen. I hope it can be referred back so we can avoid an embarrassing situation for the City where it gets overturned at the Municipal Board, which surely it will, based on the data that…the information that I'd be presenting to them.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Someone else may move referral. I think Councillor Wyatt's raised a number of points. But I am not going to move referral. There are a number of comments I wanted to make about this. Firstly, thank you to Councillor Wyatt for…he was going to put the Albanian community name on the map, quite literally, in this neighbourhood. So, thank you for that. That will come in due course. This is colloquially known as Sage Creek North. This is, unsurprisingly, north of the existing Sage Creek in the St. Vital end of Transcona Ward. It's an odd inclusion in Transcona Ward in that it comes all the way down to Lag and Abinojii Mikanah, formerly Councillor Vandal's, formerly Councillor Allard's. I was actually at that session when we considered this in 2014 with then Councillor Vandal. There was a surcharge. I don't remember it going to Winakwa, but that's neither here nor there. But certainly, there was a charge put on the A&S that survived through committees, survived through Council. I certainly tried to scoop the money over time to get it into Sage Creek. It was unsuccessful, so there you are. It will have to stay in the neighbourhood there. So, that would…I understand Councillor Wyatt's point on the precedent that was set with the A&S development that will contain Jennifer Jones Park, if it's ever built, across the way. The point I wanted to make, though, is, so to quote the very fine Richard Mahé from our Planning Department, "We have to build up and we have to build out." It is how you do it. You can't just do one or the other. So, here we are, we are building out. Here that is indisputable but look at the stats. It is about half single family, half multi-family. I mean, that's certainly different than we were, say, in Royalwood 20 years ago or different than in my neighbourhood 60 years ago. So, it's building out, but it's also with an eye to density. So, good work by Councillor Wyatt. Good work by Qualico pushing this forward. So, a number of concerns raised there by Councillor Wyatt. It has to be referred. It has to be referred. I know it was at community committee for some time. But so, 1,300 units. Look at that…look at that transportation impact study, 108 pages. So, this is…think of if you are developing along a mall or a corridor, or say, St. Vital Centre parking lot, you might put 1,300 units in. The proposal was actually for more than in all of Sage Creek. That was the original proposal. Donovan Toews seems to have grabbed the ball and got it down to a more reasonable size, to his credit. But my point is, this is why I asked the Mayor this question earlier: what about traffic studies? We're not going to have these sorts of public hearings in the future if we have as of right along the corridors, in the malls. We're not going to have these sorts of hearings; it will be as of right. So, we have the Standard Development Agreement. 108 pages here of traffic minutia on a development of this size. Surely, if we're putting these sorts of developments into existing neighbourhoods, we should have that as part of the Standard Development Agreement as well as some of these other charges. Look at the detail, it's 70 pages long with a discussion of some of the issues Councillor Wyatt has raised over time. There are costs here. I was at a meeting in Sage Creek, itself, yesterday. There's a new school going in. It will be the second biggest school in the division. It's a K to eight school, but with a volume of a high school: 900 kids. What's right next to it? A City Park. There's no play structure. So, they turn to the City and say, hey, can you build us a play structure in your new City Park? And we don't have an impact fee. If we had the impact fee, I would be riding high. I'd build the nice million dollar play structure, but we don't have that. So, there's no money in the bank. There's no money to raise money from the new development, so what do we do? I don't…we don't have the LDR funds that we used to and Councillor Orlikow has spoken quite eloquently about that and the loss of that revenue which stays in the ward for some of these new developments. So, while this isn't a mall and corridor case, it certainly speaks to the need of having some sort of intelligent development agreement when we look at the malls and corridors. I mean, just look at the amount of work that's gone into this for 1,300 units. The transit studies, the transportation studies, all of the condition, the parks, the play structures. So, a lot of work done here by Qualico who have been very good to deal with in Sage Creek proper, Sage Creek South. Hopefully we can work out something here. There was a cryptic reference to St. Vital Road in here, which apparently, is an old alignment of the current St. Vital Road, which is actually in my ward. But the study uses interchangeably Bishop Grandin and Abinojii, which is understandable over the arc of time this was prepared. So, my thanks to Qualico and Councillor Wyatt for pushing this forward. Though my point here really is, given the size of this, look at…look at the amount of work that's gone in. And that…that precinct plan was developed 10 years ago, it was 2014, it was near the end. It was May of '14, I believe, or June, near the end of Councillor Vandal's arc. We had Precinct K one month and then to J the next. So, good to see this developing. Good to see it in a Richard Mahé-like, we're building out, but also, with multi-family in a responsible way, so we'll get some housing units there. Quite a few actually. So, I don't know, if there's a referral, there's a referral, I am fine with that. But let's just keep this sort of…look at the work done here. Look at the ability of the area councillor to do something for the residents just as, Madam Speaker, you did for your residents with the North Gate Mall, to your credit. So, let's just bear that in mind as we look at the development agreements. I know the Mayor wants to expedite in the malls and the corridors, I get that. That's fair. He ran on it; he's trying to implement it. But we need to have some detail on what is going to be in these development agreements before we have the public hearing November 19th. So, my thanks to Councillor Wyatt for moving this along.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Are we going to have all this speaking before we move to layover? Okay, on the advice of Councillors Orlikow and Wyatt, I move layover, not referral, but layover to the next Council meeting. May I speak?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Schreyer: Alright, I think it's the best idea now. You just…we just got an earful from Councillor Wyatt showing high due diligence on this motion as it moves. This is layover not referral, thus I ask if I may speak. This is not instruction, it's not a referral. I'm asking.

Madam Speaker: Go ahead.

Councillor Schreyer: Okay, thank you. I don't have too much to say. Honestly, if we are not going to speak any further, I'm not going to say much.

Madam Speaker: That's just three minutes, yeah, not eight. And then, Councillor Duncan, you can rebut if you wish.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. I mean, look, look at the due diligence just shown by Councillor Wyatt on this in terms of how it's changed through standing committee. That is a lot of due diligence. Let's face it, coming from the guy…you can't drive around, walk around, ride your bike around Transcona, which we do, and say, this is what Councillor Wyatt stopped. Councillor Wyatt's not stopping anything. He's just trying to do his best and, in this case, he's got his concerns. Councillor Orlikow…look, when you've got Councillor Mayes sort of backing it up with his own…as only Councillor Mayes can do in terms of his explanation of chronology. I've never seen anybody explain like Councillor Mayes. Did it again, his chronology on the events that lead up to these things and his concerns about it, as well. Councillor Orlikow as the former chair, as well, recommends a layover. I do believe that's the best we can do. And I'm not even going to speak a minute on this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you. With that…

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Point of information. Point of information.

Madam Speaker: There's no information, Councillor.

Councillor Wyatt: Well, point of order then. The reason we're doing a layover is because, apparently, if we do referral, it has to go back to public hearing, and we don't want to go back to public hearing. A layover would allow a month, which would allow time to have the discussion with the staff as well as the Mayor's Office.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, got it. Councillor Dobson. That is correct…correct information. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Yeah, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Just to let my Council colleagues know here, it was the wish of the committee chair to move this motion forward today. Just from a perspective of our committee, as I am a member of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development along with Councillors Dobson and Allard. There were some questions raised at P&D about the legality of some of the requests made. They were also made aware that this application had been delayed 70 days. And should it not move forward in this process, it would risk any process…progress being made in 2024 if there should be any further delay here today. The applicant was satisfied with the Public Services' recommendations. Our committee and I guess I can't speak for all the members of the committee, but we did vote unanimously on this. It was our understanding that the Public Service recommendation was to clean up a lot of the wording that came from the community committee on that.

Madam Speaker: It's three minutes, as well. Should be down to about two now.

Councillor Duncan: It's okay. And, although, I hear what the area councillor is saying there. As we went through, I didn't feel as though…and I reflected that in my vote at committee that anything was, in particular, being taken away from this precinct here plan, but more so cleaned up and ensured that the wording was correct on a lot of the recommendations put forward. Because clearly, and it's my understanding that EKT spent eight hours in this meeting. So, there was a lot that was put into that. So, not to take anything away from it, but more so to clean it up. You know, from a personal standpoint, looking at this as a member of the committee, I was concerned about having a developer pay over 400,000 dollars potentially to a…and I could be wrong, to a community club that was not in this plan here. And that was one of the kind of red flags, so for me. But other than that, you know, most of the asks I the thought were pretty reasonable. And the recommendations that were put forward by the Public Service to work in step with the community committees' recommendation and the applicant were reasonable.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Duncan. And now, we'll have the vote on the…we're voting on…Councillor Schreyer has moved layover to the next meeting of Council for this item. And that's what we are voting on. You have heard what's been said, so I'll call the vote. All in favour. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Mayes, Orlikow, Schreyer, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Gilroy, Lukes and Santos.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 5, Nays 10.

Madam Speaker: The referral is lost. We'll continue with debate on this item. I've got a list. Councillor Schreyer spoke. Councillor Orlikow, Councillor Eadie and then Councillor Allard. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, the…Councillor Wyatt has really just sort of shaken the tray of the concerns I have in general, what is going on right now at city hall, where we consider everybody is in a box and everything has to go fast because we have to get building up. We have to get those units online quicker. And the public input is important, but really, later on, it won't matter anyways because of the as of right. Councillor Mayes points out some discrepancies about the issue going forward about traffic studies. And it goes back to a day when, again, I will show my ageism again a bit here, when a councillor gets up from an area, a councillor with a really big project that raises concern, we used to, in the back…good old days, we used to respect the area councillor and say, okay, if you have a minor (inaudible) small but you have some very good concerns, we'll try to address that. And we should take the time to respect the area councillors, the big projects. They've got a major impact on the neighbourhood. And I have some serious questions. The Chair is not here to explain it. I appreciate Councillor Duncan has tried. But again, so I know that we are all into speeding up the housing supply and affordability, whatever, or densification or whatever terms you want to use today. But I just…getting to the process quicker. I've had a…recently a very large development that went through in my neighbourhood. There was no contribution to any community center. There was no park, actually. They don't even have the area square. But I knew this Council was going to rush it through because we got tired of it. So, I tried to do the best I could within that, but again, I also felt that at the time, we have lost that sense of respecting the area councillors, then we have more of an ideology that we have in our heads that overrides area councillor's concerns. I am not ready there…I'm not there yet. I believe Winnipeg still, and you may have heard me say it many times, it's the great mosaic of different neighbourhoods that are combined to make Winnipeg. It's not one Winnipeg, it's a whole bunch of Winnipegs together, and they're all unique and different. So, we need to allow that area councillor's voice. And again, you've heard me talking about why I'm not keen on as of right. Why I wasn't keen on getting rid of pre-applications. These are areas where the area councillor can actually provide some input and try to help projects go forward. Sometimes, you know, I can be accused of getting in the way, well, there's lots of things I just don't approve. It doesn't mean you should stop a development, but the area councillor should have a voice and say, you know what, I don't even…I think that is bad. Well, thanks area councillor, but we don't care, we're still going forward. That is fine. That's the administration's choice. But that voice is being taken out of the system. It will be taken out of the system with malls, except for the public hearing. We're not going to get all the details. Every land is different, so we're not going to share. So, when I say that we need to move forward today because if we don't, we can't get into 2024 area, you know, so what? Let's do a development right. Let's respect the area councillor, but that's over. I guess those days are the things of the past. We are now thinking of one city at all. The public really doesn't have a voice anymore. You'll see…I don't know how many people showed up the last public open house. Probably 10, maybe a little bit more. I don't think it was too many. I saw the…I saw the poster boards. I am still confused about them. And I'm looking forward to when a public hearing happens. But again, I don't believe, I think, I know…I am very concerned about the fact that we're removing the public's voice in the things that matter to them the most, which is their major investment they have, is their house. And they…and all the effort they put into their neighbourhoods. And as area councillors, our job is to represent that voice. Councillor Wyatt…and we all know Councillor Wyatt does things that go woof to us sometimes, but sometimes not. He's actually quite brilliant sometimes. That's kind of where he's at. So, again, this…he's raised some really good points today, that why would you have a gravel road sitting there forever. Again, don't know. But he's raised enough points today, after a long…he's even mentioned how long the EKT meetings were. Well, again, they went through all this. Well, what did the P and D say? Well, no, you guys said that at EKT with all the public hearing, but we are going to get rid of this and this and this and this. I don't know those things. I didn't read this before I came today. Because it's, again, a little rare that it comes up. But Councillor Wyatt has made a good point. Give Councillor Wyatt a little respect. Let the area…give the neighbourhood a little respect. Lay it over, just 30-days. We can get some more information. I will be able to dig into it a little bit more. Councillor Rollins will be back as

Chair so you can maybe have a bit more explanation. But she's not. So, again, for those reasons, I wanted to lay it…I wanted to have it laid over, but not. Otherwise, I won't be supporting this today because, again, Councillor Wyatt has raised enough concerns for me that we're just eliminating the public's concerns. We're pretty well negating out…PP&D, they didn't have a public…the public hearing was over. So, they just…the public didn't really have a say on this anymore. Remember that? So, once they go through the community committee, PP&D says what they said, well, the public doesn't have another venue to say anything, they have the area councillor now to only go to. Again, so laying this over for a little bit will respect the public. It would have. It would have, but that was denied. We're going to respect the area councillor? Denied. So, that is where we stand. So, unfortunately, even though it may be an okay developer or not, I think all the votes are here because everything that I'm talking about will be considered, in some peoples' heads, it's red tape. That's what will be considered. And we just need to build, build, build. That's all that really matters. Again, I think we need to build good, we need to build well, and we need to build with respect where the context of where it's going into. So, again, I won't be…based on what Councillor Wyatt said today, the concerns he has, I'm going to stand with Councillor Wyatt, and I won't be supporting this.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, we have a need, we've got to build housing. I get that. I want to reflect, there was a moment, I believe the councillor from River Heights did convince Council that a particular decision through P&D was not appropriate for his area or neighbourhood. And he did put it on the floor, enough argument, that we did defeat it. If you defeat this report, it is not moving forward. Council is going to vote and it's not moving forward. I will point out that we could talk about a hope and a prayer, that see, it's easier for the developer to file a complaint at the Municipal Board. However, I heard the councillor from Transcona, who has done a great job. And you know, I remember hearing from a developer like Gem Equity about how upset they were. But Councillor Wyatt got a bunch of things in there that built a proper neighbourhood. It wasn't about just developers making money. It was about when people buy into that neighbourhood, eventually, they are getting a nice neighbourhood. Park City, Transcona. Why? Because Councillor Wyatt has spent many years and others in Transcona to make sure there is parks. And force them, actually, to…to actually install play items in parks and things for activities in parks, which, you know, we can ask a developer on a bigger neighbourhood like this, set aside some land for a park. But they're not paying any money into it. The argument we always hear is, oh, when they're built there will be so much property tax dollars that we'll be able to build all this stuff from the city. Did that happen in Waverley West? Where did we get the 23 million extra dollars to build what we…oh, no, don't worry, there will be plenty of dollars to build the big rec…regional rec center in Waverley West. Not. That's the reality. So, what I'm saying is…oh, and just to make the point, the Province came out and announced, we amended and asked for the lower the number to 150 residents to file petition to the Municipal Board. It originally talked about 500. What did the Province come back with? 300. So, there is no empowerment of the people who were supportive of what Councillor Wyatt introduced into this subdivision and agreements. So, now if they want to go after it, now they need 300. 300. That is very difficult. This is a brand-new neighbourhood. Now, if you got a problem about 400,000 dollars to a community centre…because there won't be money, enough property taxes, for the community centre. It just so happens this particular area, yeah, the community centre we are talking about it's not in this specific neighbourhood, but remember, our community centres represent more than one neighbourhood. There is a catchment area, Madam Speaker. It covers a whole certain area. So, does it really matter if it is going to a community centre that is probably going to have to serve it in their catchment area. Also mentioned about boundaries. Yeah, it was in St. Boniface, it's in St. Vital, is it in Transcona? The problem is, I wouldn't necessarily call that area down there St. Vital either. If we were willing to establish a 16th ward, maybe it would have a name that really represented the area, but that is not the case. So, over the years, boundaries change. That is what happens. They don't really reflect what they are or whatever because of…you know, we are not moving away from 15 because apparently it is too expensive to add another one, whatever. So, Madam Speaker, my point is, I am voting in opposition to this report. If enough people vote in opposition, that's it. And I will point out, you know, Qualico. So, they're going to be upset with us. Well, let me…you know, Gem Equity, they weren't very happy in the past, but they did build a good community. It happened, right? Dragging their…they were really upset about it, but they did it. And that is good. I will point out that Qualico is getting the fast track for bringing servicing out to St. James. The former city Councillor Scott Gillingham and then Mayor Scott Gillingham, is ensuring that a new neighbourhood is being built in St. James, well, just north of Crestview, I would say, in Assiniboia. I wouldn't necessarily call it St. James. But anyway, the point is, is that secondary plan and everything went through. Everything is decided in there. And the density is pretty…it's not all that great compared to some of the other neighbourhoods we are building now. This one proposes good density. I like it. Councillor Wyatt does understand. He is the king of Sim City. He probably used to beat that game all the time. I don't know. Anyway, building a better city. So, I am just going to vote against this report because I think P&D should have moved forward with what Councillor Wyatt was trying to put through. If you want to call it a legal or whatever, I mean, Qualico could have went to the Municipal Board and said, well, this is unfair and then it would be struck. Thank you.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, as pointed out by I think my esteemed colleague, Councillor Mayes, this is a 70 plus page report. I understand why, Madam Speaker, I heard the local councillor say that no one reached out to him because this is a public hearing item. And as it is a public hearing item, the public hearing has been conducted and the decision-making body is Planning, Property and Development, Executive Policy Committee and Council. So, I think that's why, Madam Speaker, there may not have been communication with the area councillor on this. I wanted to for…I guess for clarity, just read what the standing policy committee recommendation is. Maybe that is…that is material and different than what the community committee had recommended. Okay, so we had debate at committee and the Public Service had a series of amendments because the decision was relatively lengthy. As I think some of my colleagues have mentioned that the councillor for Transcona is, at times, quite loquacious in his…in his decisions. So, some of the things that the standing policy committee…standing policy committee has said is, for example, adding the following new condition: three. So, section one general comments, "The proposed development currently has adequate wastewater service based on passing servicing review at the time of valuation. However, for projects that extend over a long period, the ability of servicing may diminish as project progresses due to other developments utilizing the remaining capacity in interim. The City of Winnipeg's wastewater infrastructure capacity is only reserved for specific proposal. Once a permit application has been reviewed…has been reviewed and approved by Water and Waste, (inaudible) once the wastewater system reaches its capacity, any new proposals to discharge additional flow will be declined." So, I think that's a good fail safe, Madam Speaker, in the chamber in terms of insuring we have the wastewater and water capacity or the wastewater capacity in order for this development to go online.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Point of order. I believe I heard the councillor correct that he said that it was a condition of mine. This was not a condition of mine, this was actually wording from the Public Service. I placed a condition on it saying that it is incumbent upon Water and Waste Department to notify the applicant in advance. That condition is being eliminated. But this is a condition that came from the department, from the Public Service Madam Speaker. Not from myself.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, I will retract any comments related to the councillor for Transcona. Please accept my apologies if I did not…if I misrepresented the councillor in any way. I will stick to the report that's in front of me today. Another one of the conditions that was a standing policy committee recommendation, so P&D, "The developer shall, at no expense", so adding the new condition 12, "The developer shall at no expense to the City legally open property required for a local street between block 5, block 2, and public reserve a, to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works." In section 4, "That we add the…that the standing policy committee recommended that the following new condition 9C be added: the developer agrees to undertake the required pathway and sidewalk through Manitoba Hydro lands during the initial phase of construction." Another amendment b, "As the city's discretion…at the City's discretion, the equivalent value of obligation above may be used in continuing maintenance of Plessis Road and portions of Dawson Road to control dust, including potential chip seal to the maximum value of the obligation at time of invoicing." So, as I understand from the Public Service, developer obligations are in the event where there's a shared resource. The intent of the Public Service is to build back the prorated amount of what the…what the lands are getting in terms of benefit from various public investments. And so, that was explained to my satisfaction, again, at the standing policy committee. Another amendment, "The the developer agrees to undertake the required traffic signal installation no later than the completed build up, fine as all permits applied for, updates when a lauded under this application. Delete condition 26 C(3) and replace with the following, 'construct primary asphalt pathways, the location of which will be subject to the approval of East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee.'" And finally, to address…well, maybe not finally. Like, I'm…after going through this for some time, when we hit this item and heard from the Public Service their recommendation, which was delete 26 C(6) in its entirety and replace with the following, "A fenced in court for basketball, pickleball that would accommodate four courts, similar to what was approved", et cetera, et cetera, green space, dog parks, pickleball; the Public Service explained to us that this was from their conversations with the proponent, what the proponent would be willing to support in line with this application and not the other proposed investment which would have been...one second. Anyways, I'll just use words instead of numbers. Should have been a substantial transfer to a facility outside of this development. We know from the impact fee decision, the judge ruled that the way in which the City of Winnipeg imposed this impact fee was not legal, however, there were some ways that the City of Winnipeg may consider in terms of bringing in a new revenue stream. And that's, from my understanding, one that would have the investment from the proponent or the landowner be invested in or around the area where the property would be of benefit. The proposed amendment from the Public Service is clearly to the favour of development. The community committee recommendation to take a substantial amount of money and fund an outside amenity is, from my reading of the Hemson decision, impact fee decision, if the proponent is amendable, which I understand that they are amendable, based on the Public Service recommendation, then that's all we get at these public...at these decision-making levels. The public hearings are closed, all we have is ourselves and the Public Service, the standing policy committee. So, this is the information that we have. So, at this point…

Councillor Wyatt: I would like to rise on a point of order. I want to put it on the record as a point of order that the legal opinion that's now been expressed at the P and D Committee was never offered by the Public Service at the community committee. At not…at any point was legal

Councillor Allard: Point of order.

Councillor Wyatt: Opinion provided at the community committee where the decisions are being made.

Councillor Allard: This is my (inaudible). Point of order.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I'm putting it on the record. I'm putting it on the record.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We've heard you.

Councillor Wyatt: This will be considered. That that was not information given at the community committee. Indeed, it was earmarked towards a community committee…a community based on a precedent set of a previous development application, whereby…

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, why…why are we…

Madam Speaker: We've heard you.

Councillor Wyatt: Acting for the community club that is actually…

Madam Speaker: We've heard you. Thank you. Councillor Allard, back to your speaking time. We've heard you.

Councillor Allard: Drop this, or this could be challenged at any level, whether it's the Municipal Board or the courts.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, if you want to wrap up, there's…you've got a minute.

Councillor Allard: Well, do I have a minute?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Allard: Okay. So, I was ready to go right back to the Public Service recommendation because it was getting pretty gnarly, this…this amendment for the proposed development. And from my…from my understanding, my own understanding, not legal opinion expressed by the Public Service to myself, but from my reading of and conversations that are normally available to the public on the impact fee. This is not coming from the Public Service. This is coming from me. And so, based on all of that, I was ready to go with the Public Service recommendation. Councillor Duncan, to his credit, said, whoa, let's meet in the middle. The councillor and community committee have done…won't mention the councillor. The community committee have done their work. And so, let's go with this middle ground. And I think we should do what the Public Service said we need to.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on the item? Seeing none, Councillor Duncan to close.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you. I'm rapidly trying to scroll through the report here, Madam Speaker, to recall some of the more discussion. And again, the intention here was not to strip any of the amenities away from this plan. I just took note, the recommendations include play structures, sitting areas, dog park or pickleball court, covered picnic areas – areas, paved pathways, traffic calming outside of the planned area. So, these requirements of these play structure areas are a part of the requirements. But as you can tell, this went over and above. Again, there was no intention to not provide the area with amenities or do the bare minimum. I think this displays that it's over the bare minimum. In fact, I had a discussion with the area councillor in regards to covered picnic areas and, in fact, how much those cost now and how he encouraged me to get those in my area because they are such a great amenity. But again, no intention to strip this down in any way, Madam Speaker. It was to clean it up and that's what the committee's intention was and hopefully accomplished.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, we'll...

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I just want it put on the record that it was...it's been construed that we've asked for things beyond and above. And I want to put it on the record, Madam Speaker, that is not the case. That is not the case.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt we've made the point. You've made the point. Thank you. And the microphones are off, once again. We're having the vote now. I hear you. 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, Lukes, Mayes, Santos.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gilroy, Orlikow, Schreyer, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

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

Madam Speaker: Item 6 passes. Onto by-laws under this committee now. Councillor Duncan as chair.

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

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. On behalf of Councillor Rollins, I'd like to move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 121/2024, By-law No. 122/2024, By-law No. 123/2024, By-law No. 124/2024 and By-law No. 125/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 121/2024, By-law No. 122/2024, By-law No. 123/2024, By-law No. 124/2024 and By-law No. 125/2024.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

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

Councillor Duncan: I'd like to move that By-law No. 54/2024 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 54/2024.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Yes, I'd like to move that By-law No. 54/2024 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Duncan? Councillor Mayes.

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

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, it's…it's almost one of these awful, are you aware questions, because to be fair to Councillor Duncan, I mean, it's really a question for Councillor Rollins. So, I guess, could you ask Councillor Rollins to confirm the following. On Monday, I had raised concerns about the lack of provision of the map, the map that has been promised to us since November of last year, the map that will indicate the precise contours of what we meant by 800 metres walking distance from bus stops on frequent transit corridors. That mapping exercise has been underway for over a year, we know that from the HAF application itself, which Councillor Orlikow has indicated…talks about the mapping having been done. To the credit of the staff, talked to Hazel Borys, after 8 o'clock Monday night, talked to Donovan Toews, who's…at 10 to 10, and talked to Veitch early on Tuesday morning. The gist of it was, we're on it, we're almost done, I said by December and it was sort of, well yeah, obviously, for sure. So, I would hope that when we next meet here in November, we have the map. It's important to people of Winnipeg to know if their street, if their property's going to be in the majored issue of fourplexes is the size of the lot. This is kind of the…tertiary, the secondary, the window dressing instead of height limitation, but it's important still. If you lived on Goldthorpe in Councillor Chambers' ward, you saw the draft map from last year, you'd say, this is no impact on me. You see that map, now…

Madam Speaker: Question, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: We extended the frequent line all the way down, so 800 metres each way, there's a whole lot of river parks south that's not going to be affected. So, we need the map. So, to Councillor Duncan, please ask Councillor Rollins to confirm that we will have the map hopefully by next…by the time we next meet at…in late November. I appreciate Councillor Duncan's in an acting capacity.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And through you to Councillor Mayes, I will and I know that it's equally important to a lot of my residents to have this map as well, to understand exactly how this may impact their property or for those that are interested in potentially doing some of this development, where exactly it is that the opportunity may arise. So, yes, I won't commit to a timeline on behalf of Councillor Rollins but yes, I will ask and insist on my behalf as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Again, you might want to take it under advisement for Councillor Rollins. But Councillor Eadie and myself undertook a legal opinion by Antoine Hacault, Thompson Dorfman Sweatman, which was supplied to the Mayor's office indicating that the public hearings held to date with regards to the HAF are illegal, based on the decision by City Council to have this body as a whole make the decisions in a hearing fashion, which was never done before, but it was the decision of November of last year by this council to do that. Is it the intent of EPC, therefore, to re-hear all the items heard thus far, based on Mr. Hacault's advice, that is incumbent on the City to do this, otherwise, the decisions made thus far on the HAF will be challenged and we know that the courts in the past have overturned us not on content, but on process. We now have a 14-page legal opinion indicating that everything done thus far in the public hearing at the Property and Development Committee is contrary to our own City policy that we have set and that the hearings have to be completely re-held again. Is it…could that be passed on to the chair? And I fully expect you not to be able to respond to it, but if it could be passed on.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Oh, I have a detailed response for the…no, I'm just kidding. Yes, absolutely, I will past that on as I'm tied onto my ear here. Regarding the legality of the public hearings, I won't speak on behalf of Executive Policy Committee as that falls under the…His Worship, the Mayor, as well. So, thank you I will pass on to Councillor Rollins.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question right into it, please.

Councillor Wyatt: Sure, and are you aware that in the event that our Legal department is counselling a different legal opinion, that it really…are you aware that it's…you're really throwing luck to the wind, it depends on what now, will be challenged in the courts. And, in light of the fact that we're receiving funding already from Ottawa, in the event, that has challenged the courts and the courts overturn our hearing, we'll be in an embarrassing situation of having to take in federal money yet not delivering on our end of the agreement. Are you aware of that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: I will take that under advisement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question. Councillor Mayes, second round.

Councillor Mayes: Again, it's unfortunate that Councillor Duncan's in an acting capacity. We will be having a public hearing, quite unusual actually, November 19th, I think in this room. It's difficult in that, you want to have a real public hearing and yet, we have hanging over us this…well we can't do what CMHC or the Federal Minister prohibit, so we're going to have a handful of delegates, perhaps, on this one and hundreds on the next one, we'll see. Perhaps, Councillor Duncan could ask Councillor Rollins to clarify. I would like to know, going into that public hearing from the clerks, from Doug Brown, from somebody in this place, how we handle that. Normally if it's a public hearing, we're the deciding body…here we have this, overarching presence of CMHC and the Federal Minister. So, how are we to proceed if what we decide might get vetoed the next day by CMHC or the Federal Minister? It's quite an exceptional circumstance. I appreciate, again, Councillor Duncan's in an acting capacity here, but I think before we proceed, we could perhaps…

Madam Speaker: Question please.

Councillor Mayes: (Inaudible) get an email from the clerks or Legal saying, yeah, this is…this is how we're proceeding because do we have to reconvene if we decide on X and CMHC says no, you can't have that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Yeah, so, just for clarity. We're seeing how we proceed if we do not concur with the guidelines set out by CMHC and the Housing Accelerator Fund? Madam Speaker, through you…

Councillor Mayes: A fair question. My question is more, decisions will be made on the 19th, but we've been told on some of these items, well, we'd love to accommodate you, but you know the Federal Minister or CMHC might not favour that. So, how do we…we will make a decision on the 19th, what if the next day CMHC says, no, we don't want any of these traffic studies for developments and malls. Nope, none of that. Do we reconvene then, what…what is one to do?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Probably shouldn't offer my opinion on this, but I will anyway. I would be in favour of seeing several different parameters set out in the overall plan that ensures the public is being heard. Councillor Mayes and I do agree on some of the parameters that should be in place, disagree on some too, but, I think we'll have a healthy debate around this council table with everyone at the public hearing.

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

Councillor Mayes: Easy to follow up in that it would be helpful if we could get the clerks or Legal to clarify what…it's an unusual circumstance, so I think…it's unusual, A, that Council's hearing it, B, that we have this…overlord, thank you, overhanging authority that could veto what we do, in which case, do we reconvene?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Absolutely, will follow up with the Clerks…ask Councillor Rollins.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And that concludes our Question Period under that committee. Next is Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and the Environment, also Councillor Duncan, our chair. There's one item.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT DATED OCTOBER 4, 2025

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'll put on my other hat now and move adoption of consent agenda with the lone item, Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We have a notice of motion under this committee. It is moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Wyatt. It's regarding the utility dividend policy. It will be on next month's Council agenda. It is on next month's Council agenda, that's correct. Mr. Clerk? Yeah, I've got a different notation here, I

just want to check with you. Thank you. First, we'll deal with the notice of motion we received last month. Councillor Mayes, your opportunity to introduce it. It's on retrofit investments.

Councillor Mayes: Is it Duncan, or is it…

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT NOTICE OF MOTION

Madam Speaker: It was moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Gilroy. This is a notice of motion. So, the Chair will not be introducing.

Councillor Mayes: Okay, fair enough. Thank you. Yeah, some of the delegates really spoke to this item. And in fact, some of the submissions you see on the item above are really talking about this. What is this? This was…we got a report back in 2023 about the potential carbon tax savings of investing in retrofits. This is a revisiting of that requesting referral to the budget, pointing out that if one uses the same math that was used at the Kenaston debate, and the math there switched what would have been a...in the cost benefit, would have gone from cost to benefit the environmental advantages of saving carbon tax emissions. So, use the same math here, basically, this is much more effective in terms of reducing carbon tax emission...sorry, reducing carbon emissions and at a much lower cost. The previous item, really, you could say many of the same things. The one that is now gone for yet another study of six months or a year. We need to do something on these retrofit items. So, this should be referred to the budget. It didn't get adopted last year. Maybe it will get…some of it will be adopted this year. The report prepared in September of last year was somewhat lamentable in that we asked the Public Service to give us your best shot. How can we use this money to get the maximum amount of savings? One of the items was Eldon Ross Pool for, I think, five million bucks, it was going to save all of five tonnes a year. Come on, that's just retrofitting an old building, had nothing to do with energy savings at all. Do better work, I would say. Luckily, it's all academic, because a month later, the staff said to sell Eldon Ross Pool. So, a particularly foolish item to have included, I think, in retrospect. But leaving that aside, let's refer the matter to the budget. We should be doing some of these emission reductions. This reflects a couple of things. A couple of things made in the mayoral platform to start trying to do some sort of cooperation with external agencies, to do geothermal, to do solar. And then, you'll remember that's item 4-6 in our strategic plan. Item 4-7 is…in our strategic plan, is the green utility that was in the mayoral platform. I attempted to get some movement on that as chair, meeting a wall of Public Service resistance. Largely the decision was to try and proceed with the retrofits. So, I would love to have briefed Councillor Duncan on what's been going on with the external agencies, but I don't have that briefing from the mayoral staff who were doing the consultations with external agencies. So, I really have no idea what might be happening in terms of funding under item 4-6 on the strategic plan. So, what you have in front of you points out the advantages, and a number of speakers referenced that. We did pass this CEIR. I don't know if anybody read it. I don't know if anybody takes it seriously. We have this problem here of passing rather grandiose policies under the former mayor largely and then not doing anything with them. So, here was an attempt to actually put some money into retrofits that would save carbon tax and would save energy and would have the social benefit. The kind of social benefit that was identified in the whole Kenaston debate. The social benefit of reducing carbon emissions. Just refer it to the budget and we can see where it goes. The confusion, also, that some of the speakers or indications, there's another motion that's coming from our Climate Action Committee. And we did create this committee under Councillor Gilroy's push two years ago, to provide thoughts, input. There's a motion coming about reducing reliance on natural gas heating. That's a separate matter from what you have here. I know Councillor Duncan and the media said, well, I want…I want the utility to be laser focused on the North End project. And that's a defensible statement. I think what…what that, Madam Speaker, if we could…I am having trouble focusing. Some of our colleagues continuing to talk here. It's a defensible position for Councillor Duncan. I think what it leads to is what we should be debating is maybe we need to take the office of...the Sustainability Office out of Water and Waste and put it back with the CEO where it started. It was seen as a cost savings to shove it into the utility, and now it's paid for out of water and utility rates, not property tax dollars. I think that was a mistake that should be rectified because if we're going to be laser focused on the North End project, I don't know who is going to be doing all this other work. This work that we just approved that would take another 180 days to study retrofits, the kind of work that we're talking about right now. The kind of work that's talked about in our strategic plan to try and have some sort of retrofit investments with external agencies. So, again, I don't know what's going on with any of these external agencies. And unfortunately, therefore, couldn't brief Councillor Duncan. But I think the push for today, all we can do, given the wall of resistance that came up from our civil servants to the idea of a green utility, about all we can do is try and do some real action here. You heard people say, let's not just have anymore talk or more road maps. Let's do something. So, this is the chance to actually do something. And maybe we don't do all of these buildings, but we should certainly do some. And you can finger...you can cherry pick, oh, the fire station at Windsor Park has the geothermal and the new bus stop has the solar. None of which is...it's all been done by the individual departments. We need some sort of coordination here, some sort of priority setting in order to do these sorts of investments. I think it's

irresponsible to not do some of this if we're going to pass these giant road maps about energy savings. And frankly, if we're going to approve the Kenaston stretch...and we're not undoing the Kenaston vote here. And there's no budget yet to do the Kenaston thing. But if we're going to recognize the social value of carbon reductions with the Kenaston vote, then surely, we should give that some weight when we talk about investments. So, I think this shouldn't be controversial today. I think what we need to think about, maybe as we go forward is, if we are going to laser focus on the North End plant, and I would like to laser focus on that and the combined sewer work so we're getting done in the 2040s, not the 2090s. But if we're going to do that, then let's move that Office of Sustainability over to Municipal Accommodations or CEO. Councillor Rollins certainly felt she should be the one heading up the work on the green utility and on some of these retrofits. And maybe that's the case because if no one in the Water and Waste utility is going to be looking in to do any of this work, then none of it's going to happen. So, I think that's worth considering. So, you saw a number of speakers earlier today, many of whom have been here for years. The math speaks for itself in the motion. Thanks to Councillor Gilroy for seconding. But I think we should refer this to the budget. I think it should be taken seriously. It is a chance to get some savings and to get some societal benefit, the same kind of societal benefit which I felt was very important when we made that debate about Kenaston. So, perhaps, for another day the issue of if we move the Office of Sustainability out of the utility, that would certainly allow us to use some more utility dollars to actually do water and sewer work rather than building retrofit work. But I look forward to having that debate, hopefully, as part of the coming rate report fight in December. I'll have some comments when I close, as well. Thank you.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And through you to all of Council colleagues. First of all, I want to thank Councillor Mayes for raising a couple of key points. He's right, yes, this…aspects of this were part of…and are part of the campaign commitment plan and I certainly do want to move on them. A couple of reasons I won't be supporting this motion today though, and it's primarily this: first of all, the councillor in his motion or in his comment certainly referenced the September 29th, 2023, report that did come to us. And it was the report on...the title was, 'Retrofits to Reduce Carbon Tax Payment Obligations'. Two very important aspects of that report: one is the number that he has cited here. And rightly so, because that's the number that is in this report. I read from the exec summary of that report, "Approximately 50.6 million in retrofit investments are identified at a class five level." And there, to me, lies the rub because we know that a class five level is just that, a class five level. And all of us know that right now in Water and Waste with the cost of all things they continue to climb. I think it's very important to get an update on that class five number to get a more likely number, a more accurate number before we refer anything to the budget. The good news is, in part, is we just voted to do that in many ways because the report that we just voted on moments ago is the Building Emissions Reduction Strategy. The Buildings Emission Reduction Strategy is cited in the September 2023 report. And it says, "The financial implications of all of these retrofits…financial implications will be detailed as part of the Building Emissions Reduction Strategy." So, the point of the matter is, just moments ago, we tasked our staff…we gave our staff another 180 days to come back with this report, this Building Emissions Reduction Strategy. Which will detail, it says, "The financial implications of the retrofitting." And in the September 2020…the September 2023 report, and councillor…I appreciate that Councillor Mayes has rightly pointed out there's a chart in that report or a table in the report listing 15 City buildings, including the Eldon Ross Pool. Which just a moment ago, he rightly…he, you know, stated that we deem that now surplus. So, in the updated report that we're going to get on building emissions reduction strategy, my hope is that it would also update the properties that may be eligible for retrofits, carbon and carbon tax and utility cost savings all potentially outlined with updated class estimate, with updated building list that could be…those buildings that are qualified or would be likely candidates for the retrofits. And it also says in the report that we just voted on, the Building Emissions Reduction Strategy, it says that "That the Public Service report on the development of a Building Emissions Reduction Strategy to reduce energy and carbon in the City's buildings, including asset management, assessment and prioritization approach." Again, to Councillor Mayes he just pointed out, rightly so, we need to prioritize. We need to do priority setting. And this report that when it comes back in 180 days says it will have that prioritization, which is important. It also says in the funding and resource requirements and then see an implementation plan. So, all that to say, that work needs to happen first so we can get the right number or much better number before we ever take it to the budget process. And so, I'm not saying no. I'm just saying not yet because I think this other work has to be done first so that we can more accurately make determinations. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So far, the debate is quite interesting. But while I had nothing to do with this notice of motion, Madam Speaker, I'm going to support it. But…and yes, so the report we just voted on, the main report, it's coming back in 180 days. It's going to be talking about...what they are talking about in there is, you know, carbon tax savings as a result of retrofitting the actual buildings. That's how, I believe, the Public Service is going to look at it. This motion here, it's saying, we're looking at…oh, well, as the Kenaston project goes across, it's expected to raise...or lower by 50 million dollars the cost of carbon, which might change with the Federal Government. I don't know what's going to happen there. But all of our environmentalists, Madam Speaker, the people who want to reduce our impact on the

climate, they are depending on the concept that there still is a carbon tax, right? It is important, don't get me wrong, though. I support reducing carbon emissions to improve our climate. But this is talking about monetary values. And I like the concept, but it's slightly off. I'm still voting for this though. I think it should be referred to budget because of the concept of how it's looking at how much we save from reducing carbon emissions related to...well, in this case, major infrastructure project. And you know, I don't know, you can measure the new…building the new…the new transit garage, for example. Supposedly, eventually it's going to be saving us a bunch of money. It's costing us a lot, but over the long run, it's going to save the City money, one would say and improve the service. But what we should be doing, and whether it's Municipal Accommodations...so, we're framing this. We talked about a road project in here. But in replacing the Arlington bridge, for example, Madam Speaker, if you're looking at budgets. Now, we did get a report and there will be a report on what affect the closing of the Arlington Bridge has had on McPhillips and Salter-Isabel. 5,000…I hear 5,000 extra trips across the Salter Bridge, meaning traffic flow is making things not only difficult for people driving or whatever, but also making it difficult for pedestrian and cyclists because the more cars you put on the road without protected bike lanes and stuff, it's dangerous, especially when you get the high flows. So, and then, on McPhillips, I'm hearing from people. They are calling me, Madam Speaker. They call it the McPhillips underpass parking lot. At peak hours it's the parking lot. It's taking people 90 minutes just to turn right…heading south to turn right on Logan after going under the underpass. 90 minutes. Like, holy. This is what happens when we didn't replace the Arlington bridge. And we waited and we waited, and we waited and we're going to have this...this is going...that's a five-year project to get a replacement in as it kind of exists today. But anyway, I digress. But once it's replaced, can you imagine how much carbon is going into the air with the McPhillips underpass parking lot? Like, really. Anyway. Anyway, sorry. I shouldn't laugh but, you know, that is the reality. And so, there will be, you know, carbon tax savings, whatever, once you build a new bridge. Yeah, there will be emissions to build a…replace a bridge. But ultimately…and people say, well, it's for cars anyway and it's still going to have that problem. But you know, a bridge has more utility than just for single passenger vehicles. It'll be a more efficient bus service that could use the Arlington Bridge and so on. Anyway, so I've used this particular motion to introduce the Arlington Bridge replacement needs to be done. But I am supporting this motion because it's talking about taking somewhat of a different approach. Rather than just measuring what you would save in carbon tax…carbon reduction in our buildings by retrofitting, it's talking about looking at other projects. How it's saving money if carbon tax continues, Madam Speaker. And all of it is towards trying to improve our environment. So, I don't see why we can't just refer this one to the budget because it is a different concept in looking at our budgeting. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer:

Translation of French Spoken: 4:37:20-4:42:12

Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I could have the opportunity to say a few words. It's with pleasure to support this motion moved by, in this case, Councillor Brian Mayes and also, Cindy Gilroy. It reminds me of a motion that was passed a few years ago, something like that, also by Brian Mayes. In this case, supported and seconded by myself. In this case, it's concerning retrofitting of buildings. Winnipeg…especially City of Winnipeg owned buildings. In this case, honestly, it's been four years, I can't exactly remember what the differences are, at least in the intention of these motions. Regardless, I will support it avec (inaudible). I'm impatiently waiting for the regulations for, in this case, not only for retrofitting for re-using electricity, like was mentioned this morning in delegation. But I believe, if I remember, we missed the word, the term, "geothermal". In this case, (inaudible) I have to admit it's been 10 minutes, 20 minutes since Councillor Mayes said that it's also a question of geothermal. So, I don't exactly understand why we can't support, vote for this motion today. I know that because the 2025 budget, it's not for a few months. But in the process, we already know that things are going to change. And we just said…Brian Mayes, it's simply just a budget referral. It's just a budget referral. So, we know all the time, every day, every week, every month that there will be changes especially because we already know that at the moment, we're working with class five estimates. I know that that will change. But that doesn't change the intention of the motion. And no matter what, it doesn't matter what we do today or until we get more specific statistics, it will change all the time during the process of the creation of the 2025 budget and even after that. Even after we've passed the budget, there will be changes for class five estimates to class three, class three to class one. So, it's always the process here. In this case, it's only a budget referral so that we can accept, go in the direction for geothermal and retrofitting for using electricity, Manitoba Hydro. It's important. And it should be part of the process. We can start right now. I respect the concern of Mayor Gillingham that the statistics, the estimates, will get better, will become more specific…specific in the next few weeks, the next few months. But we have to pass this anyways. We should start right now. It's why we have this motion for referring immediately to the budgetary process so we can start on these important priorities. So, (inaudible) I impatiently wait the rules on geothermal and the electricity in these buildings that use natural. And we shouldn't wait. So, that's it for me. Thank you very much.

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

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. First, I want to thank Councillor Mayes for bringing this motion to Council. I think there's tremendous opportunity here to make more rational decisions in this Council as it pertains to our financial bottom line. I've come to realize and this for some of us is...I was checking with our Mr. CAO and formerly Mr. Clerk. It looks like we've been around, some of us for just like 10 years. Like, our 10-year anniversary, for those who came in in 2014. Yeah, two days ago. There you go. So, I came to politics very much interested in making a better environment. And with climate change that's bubbled up to being really the top priority for me, I think, in terms of things that need immediate action. And I've found that talking about climate change gets some peoples attention but talking about people's pocketbook tends to get their attention even more. And so, I've been looking for the win-wins where the City corporate or residents or any organization happens to get a win financially which is also a win for climate change or reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the atmosphere. And buildings are…buildings are a big part of the envelope. Our information is relatively old on our inventory. Please, someone correct me if I'm wrong, but it's been a few years since we've had our inventory. But buildings are…after private vehicles, 50 percent of greenhouse gases, buildings are next and then it's greenhouse gas emissions from the Brady Landfill because methane gas, as the physicist who was here at some point, talking about climate change. And I think it was pertaining to building code. It was saying methane is…it's not 10 times worse than CO2, it's 25 times worse than CO2. So, what I've…I think there's…I think there's work to be done on here. I'm pleased to see there's a report coming on where the low hanging fruit might be. I'm going to take the Mayor's lead on not making this a budget referral, at this time. However, I'm very interested in this…in this area of research because not every investment is the same in terms of the City's bottom line. Our asset management framework includes corporate efficiency or corporate health as being one of the criterion that we consider when we're looking at investments. Personally, I think we should jack it right up in terms of all the other considerations that our Asset Management Branch deals with because, you know, we are looking for every dollar we can find. And this is one of those cases where there is…there is a number. There are several numbers that you could use for analysis. Throughout the year round, net present value, I have yet to put that one into a spreadsheet and weigh it against other projects. Capitalizing one project over another is going to...I think one of the delegates said it earlier, reduce our expenses. And if it reduces our expenses, then surely not all investments are created equal. And so, if we can save money and how much money we are spending heating and…heating and cooling our buildings, I think is a particularly crucial data point in this. And I think…I think this report...I'm not sure it will...I'm hopeful that the report will produce what I'm hoping to see, which is, really, of all possible investments, I mean, segmented in terms of our buildings, which would yield best return on investment or reduction in…reduction in spending per dollar of capital investment and then adjust to financing fees. But that's a little technical. However, I think it really is one of those opportunities where we can speak to people's...we can support people's need or want to have climate action and at the same time, demonstrate the savings that we are achieving for people using investments and policies to reduce those expenses. And, I mean, we're…what's the budget, Jeff? We're at two point some billion-dollar corporation. Surely, there are investments in there in terms of our buildings that will yield...will have a better reduction in expenses over time as long as we have the capital available for it. So, perhaps that's a little bit technocratic but I do, Madam Speaker, want to commend Councillor Mayes for bringing this forward. I'm looking forward to seeing the report come out in due time. And I do think that there is a difference between investing in a building retrofit that saves the City money and other projects where we build them and they are actually a liability going forward. So, investing in buildings is not that. Investing in other things can create new liabilities. So, thank you, Madam Speaker. I realize the hour is getting advanced. Thank you for your attention, to my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. And next is Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise; I want to thank Councillor Mayes and Councillor Gilroy for the motion before us today. And what I like about the motion is the fact that it's very specific with targets in place outlining how there's 50.6 million dollars cost retrofits for investments. And whereby, savings could potentially be estimated, apparently, at 9.2 million dollars by 2030. And it reminds me of matters that we had discussed before in the Standing Committee of Public Works. For example, with regards to our fleet. The fleet reports as a utility to us at Public Works. And where we've had discussions about the fact that we could convert the fleet to electric or hybrid against the savings that we would incur via the annual cost of diesel or fuel that we have to spend on right now. And what's interesting about it all, Madam Speaker, is that what we are looking at here is a policy being driven, not by...or an agenda, I guess, being driven, not by the need to upgrade our city, you know, to address the truck challenge we're facing in terms of the climate crisis. But rather, Madam Speaker, we're being hemmed in by our own internal policy such as our debt and what we're prepared to do in terms of debt and what we're prepared to borrow in terms of debt versus not. Now, it's been said, I've been actively…I've supported the Mayor and the Mayor's desire to widen Kenaston. I know members who have spoken to this are opposed. I believe, personally, that people will drive. I don't think it's going to be a...I think it's harder to change the culture, the car culture, than we think. I think it's easier to change the car culture from one of being one driven using non-renewable fuels to doing renewable fuels. In other words, that it's far better for us to move...even though there's a lot of controversy, I realize, with regards to the batteries and lithium batteries and so on and the mining and everything else that goes forward with that. However, I would prefer the offset of that with regards...I would prefer that over the impact that carbon is having on the environment. It's a trade off, Madam Speaker, I believe. And I believe that also our city is...needs to move in the direction of rapid transit. I've spoken about that in the past and supported that in the past. But I'd also agree that we need…we are

a trading city. We need trading corridors. But far better for us to move our vehicles to noncarbon producing forms of transportation and accept the fact that that is going to be part of the North American narrative for a little while, at least, in light of our relative prosperity compared to the other parts of the world. And I would prefer that, Madam Speaker, than to live in denial and to say, no, we're not going to need new vehicles. We're not going to be able to do anything. This is part though, in parcel, of I think a reasonable approach to addressing the climate challenges we're facing. Just as we could if we wanted to set the example in this country and retrofit our vehicles and move away from using non-renewable fuels. We could do the same with our buildings. And the only thing stopping us is our own fiscal straight jacket, if you like, that we put on ourselves in regards to debt. And a lot of that is being driven by some of the major capital projects we have to undertake. But we know we also have other major capital projects we have to undertake. It's been pointed out today, the Arlington Bridge and others. And we don't have a clue yet how we're going to address that because we don't have the ability to borrow any more money. And yet, the challenges we're facing are huge right across the board and we know we have to deal with these. And there are some solutions that are out there, though, that would take us working together as a Council, I think, to come up with them. I don't see that happening any time soon. But that is up to the executive committee and the Mayor's Office. And I think the solutions are there. They've been given in the past and they are not…they're not that difficult to undertake. It may need some provincial legislation changes to the Charter to allow for them, but it could be undertaken. Other municipalities, as has been pointedly…pointed out, are leading in this regard. Right now, literally, in the next two weeks, the COP16 is meeting in Cali, Colombia on biodiversity. We have signed the Montreal Accord of Biodiversity. We are now spending 700,000 dollars to do a greenspace master plan on exactly that. A consultant has just been hired and awarded for the purpose of coming back with recommendations on how to implement the greenspace master plan to preserve biodiversity even in the city. 30 percent is supposed to be targeted at Canada. Canada, right now, sets aside about 12 or 13 percent of its spaces for the purpose of biodiversity. This is all tied into climate change. And this is where I'm going with this, Madam Speaker. That is really the real elephant in the room on all of this debate. There are those in this chamber who believe climate change is real and the climate crisis is real. And then, there are those who kind of get glass eyed and think it's just a bunch of nonsense or they, you know, conspiracy theory or what have you. And that it's not real. That it's not happening and that it's not a priority of...should be a priority of ours today. It should be those guys over there on Broadway or who are on Parliament Hill. You know, the reality is, Madam Speaker, it is underway. We know that if the climate goes beyond 1.5 degrees, we know we're going to have challenges. We know that it could actually happen overnight. That in the event that the northern tundra and northern Canada and Russia, which is massive, and it's already happening where the permafrost is already melting. And if all of that methane should escape overnight, the climate temperatures could rise, not by a percent…a small half a percent, but literally by full percents overnight. And we are gambling here with the future, Madam Speaker. And then the fingers will be pointing. Then the fingers will be pointing at all levels of government when that happens. Why weren't you there? What did you do? Why didn't you do this? And we…and it could be within our lifetime. As a matter of fact, most of them think it will be. And so, Madam Speaker, I think this is a very good motion, and I think it should be supported. The only thing preventing us is our debt strategy. And we know how we could deal with that in terms of Water and Waste utility if we wanted to. If we wanted to look at a different governance model there, we can do that. But that takes a little bit different leadership. And these are the challenges. And I think if I can leave any thought here is that, issues like the widening of Kenaston or the building of the Chief Peguis Trail, or the need to do other upgrades around the city, you know, we're going to be…there's going to be demands in the near future for Abinojii Mikanah to be expanded and widened and grade separations. We're going to hear it because of traffic congestion. You try to go out there now at this time of day, drive on Lagimodiere. Drive on AM, as we like to call it. Drive down Kenaston. Try to imagine...I mean, if I'm at city hall this time, I'm leaving at 6:00, 6:30 because there's no way I'm getting through Lagimodiere and Regent at this time. I might as well stay here because, Madam Speaker, the congestion in this city is going through the roof. And we're not addressing it. We're not addressing the new strategic infrastructure, never mind the old strategic infrastructure that we built decades ago that's falling apart. And all of these challenges are coming at it us, including the climate crisis that's coming and the need for us to retrofit and the need for government to lead on that. And I agree with the average consumer, why should I go and buy a car that's green or hybrid or electric when there is no damn charging station. 30 percent of my power's out the door in the middle of minus 30, I lose it overnight. I don't have charging stations where I need to go, and not only that, the price of the vehicle is still higher than the price of a car that runs on gasoline. So, why would I…yet, the Federal Government has decided to hand back through rebates their gas tax, carbon tax, and they're getting...they're handing down…they're being political.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: They're handing it back, giving it back to people instead of investing it in the infrastructure. Now, I guess that's political. But at the same time…I'd ask for an extension. Two-minute.

Madams Speaker: Mayor Gillingham moves an extension of two minutes. All of those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: The reality is, Madam Speaker, and I appreciate Councillor Santos voting against me. The reality is that we have to address these issues, they're not going away. They're going to get worse. And if we don't start addressing them and trying to figure out solutions...this should take a whole initiative. This shouldn't be a one-off. This should be,

actually, a one office driving this. We did have that set up previously, it got dismantled. In terms of the whole climate crisis and everything, we had the community greenhouse gas initiative and the City-led greenhouse gas initiative in terms of trying to address our issues, but nothing…but all that kind of got dismantled over the years. And so, we're left with these motions coming forward. And to the credit of members of Council, to try to drive the public policy on this. And I hope members of Council support this because we're going to have to do it sooner or later. Because this is coming to us like a…like an electric train coming down the track. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes to close.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My term in a nutshell. My term, this term, in a microcosm this motion. So, I am tasked in post '22 election with implementing two pledges of the mayoral platform: one, to get more generation of power through geothermal and solar. See 4.6 in the strategic plan. Also implement a green utility, item 4.7 strategic plan. Councillor Rollins took some issue with this because it involves buildings, but it's left with me. Wall of Public Service opposition to the green utility. So, we come to, let's just do some retrofits then. Let's just do some retrofits. So, May of 2023, as Chair, I can forward this motion to just try and get a study of retrofits. So, we get it in September, and then it's delayed a year. And then we've had a month to consider whether to delay it some more and we decided, yes, let's delay it another six months. So, with any luck, we'll miss the fourth budget cycle, as well. We've missed, with this, three if we don't just do a budget referral today. It's just a budget referral trying to get some consideration of building retrofits. This is the third of our four budgets. If we don't vote for this today, then we're on maybe, possibly, maybe we'll consider it in the fourth cycle next year, but we'll probably be delayed again. So, I do what I'm tasked to do. I try and push this forward. The response today is, yeah. Yeah, but that report from last year contained class five estimates. Well, the wording of what we just approved for the further delay doesn't say anything that we won't be getting class five estimates in another six months if we ever get the report at all. And yeah, we can't have class five estimates in the capital budget. Well, except we can for overpass that Abinojii Mikanah and Pembina. We can for the Elmpark Bridge. We can for the East of Red Rec Plex. We can even have a class five estimate in the capital budget for the Bridgewater fountain renewal. That's a class five estimate. So, we can have class five estimates in the budget and, you know, do it until you get a class three. So, the idea that a) now we can't even refer this because it's class five is, actually, countered by a whole to of stuff that's already in the budget. Also, we're told, well, yeah, but the spiffy report that's coming back next year, that's going to have priority setting, and that's going to deal with asset management, just look at the wording on it. Yeah, well, here's what we voted on in May of 2023: identify the City of Winnipeg structures where retrofits could reduce carbon tax payments obligations in the most cost-efficient manner. Including the following: consideration of levels of servants, asset renewal and reliability. So, all this stuff we're claiming, well, now we're going to have them come back and talk about asset management and we're going to ask them to set priorities, it's exactly what we already did. It's exactly what we already did last year. So, we got a report, it is flawed. It's got the Eldon Ross Pool. So, don't do that one, but at least let's refer it to the Budget Working Group, and they can take a look at some of these and say, you know, some of these make sense and some of them don't, but at least let's consider it. But no, let's just throw it out entirely. Let's not even refer it to the budget because we'll bank on getting a report next year which, frankly, may also have class five estimates, so we can just throw that out then. Or it may also have…well, it's going to have asset renewal…asset management. Well, we already had that report. We already told them in May of '23, come back with the most cost-efficient manner of doing this. So, let's not pretend we're going to be sending different instructions it's the…it's different wording of the same instruction. Come back with a priority list that's cost efficient. We actually said, give us up to 80 million dollars in projects. You've all voted for it. That was in the 2023 motion, which was trying to implement the platform that I was tasked with trying to implement. So, I mean, I don't really understand how we're saying we're taking action here. Here's what's in the strategic plan. 4.6, which is supposedly dealing with external agencies to develop geothermal and solar options. The only action on that is this study which doesn't really actually refer at all to those things or to external agencies except saying they had the CAO come get…try and get grants from other agencies. It's…this one is talking about internal building retrofits. That's…and then look at 4.7 in the strategic plan, green utility requires initiation. Let's not pretend we're taking any action here. Like, let's just admit that there's no hope of not doing this. I mean, maybe we'll get a report back after a year and a half...well, no, a year and…19 months to do this report when we already have the CEIR from 2022 which has all sorts of energy investment road map decisions and priorities, none of which we've given any weight to. So, I would suggest let's send it to the Budget Working Group, and they can set priorities or not. Or we can pretend that we're actually doing something by asking...by waiting 19 months for a study that probably just reflects what we said in 2022 and didn't act on. That can be our action. So far, our action under the strategic plan on this is to request a study, then grant another extension, then grant another extension. Is that really action? And the other item, 4.7, the green utility, still has yet to be initiated. Lord knows I tried. There was a, as I say, firewall of opposition from the City staff. So, the consensus was, let's just try and do some retrofits. I thought we might actually try and do some retrofits. It is in the mayoral platform. We should be actually trying to do something here or we can wait another six, eight, 10, 12 months, wait till after the next budget cycle, get something back. They'll probably have class five estimates and a whole list of things in some priority, which is exactly what we already have in-hand. So, let's refer this and save a year to the Budget Working Group. Maybe they don't do anything. Maybe they take one of them. At least it would help us. It would at least reflect some of what we said is of benefit in a societal sense, which is reducing carbon emissions. We said that as part of our debate about Kenaston. We should be true to our words. Councillor Allard is right, building…it

isn’t all about transit, it isn't all about ag, it isn't all about waste disposal and composting. The building envelope stuff, building heating really matters if we want to do something about the environment, about climate change. Or we can just refer it all again for another study of the study and grant an extension of the study of the study and maybe we can log that into the strategic plan as our action, as well. I don't know. But I would encourage you to at least vote for this and refer it to the budget and we’ll see where it lands.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now vote on this notice of motion. All in favour? Contrary? Okay. Recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Schreyer, Wyatt.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. Notice of motion is lost. We're now onto Motion 4: moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Wyatt. It's regarding a utility dividend policy. It'll be an automatic referral to the standing committee.

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

WHEREAS on March 20, 2019, Council approved the amended Water and Sewer Utility Dividend Policy;

AND WHEREAS the Policy states that Council will review the Utility Dividend Policy every 4 years;

AND WHEREAS no review has occurred since 2019;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council review the Utility Dividend Policy as part of the upcoming interim Water and Sewer Rates report, anticipated during Q4 2024.

Madam Speaker: Now we'll have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Duncan? Any questions for Councillor Duncan? No? I’m going to now pass the Chair to Deputy Speaker for a short little bit.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am taking the Chair, and we're moving into the Community Services Committee. I don't think we have a report, do we, Madam...Chairperson Santos? No report?

Councillor Santos: No, there's no reports.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. Then is there any motions, Mr. Clerk, regarding...

City Clerk: There are no motions and no by-laws, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No by-laws, no motions, right. Yeah, got that. Okay. So, question period for the Chair, Councillor Santos. No questions?
Clerk: Councillor Orlikow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh, by all means, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: My question is related to the repurposing of wading pools. And really, what I…well, bottom line is, well into it right now, and I thank the Park's department for helping me figure out how to repurpose these wading pool areas, I have two of them. One I wish wasn't…wasn't closed but that was denied last budget time, because it was well used and they're quite upset. So, I knew that would happen. So again, I can't leave an empty building sitting there. It'll just be a poke in the eye, so I'm really working hard and quick to try to get these pools…these wading pools…areas turned to something else that adds some value to the neighborhood. So, what we know is with my ending LDR, because that's what's paying for these…this stuff, the LDR is about especially…only for mature neighborhoods. Don't get scared, everybody else. It's only for mature neighborhoods that lose the LDR, everybody else will be probably okay, but for River Heights-Fort Garry, we're going to lose an astronomical amount of our LDR, but I still have some left, so I'm able to use this money to try to get these sites that we decided to rationalize out, to get them back into something that the neighborhood could be proud of, not just a derelict building or a hole in the ground. So, what I…what I have found out now that I'm a Class 3 estimate now with a department is for a pergola, not your pergola for…can we talk about either before was a shade structure. It had a couple of benches, and that's not even removing a lot of the buildings. They're going to keep a lot of the buildings up for their own purposes, that site. The other site, the full removal with a nature playground, which is not the most expensive type of playground because I couldn't afford that. Just with a…a nature playground, logs, boulders, for little kiddies to go play, and it's in a nice nature setting. So, what I found out, and I'm getting to my question in a second, is that, at minimum, at minimum, this is going to cost somewhere around 220,000 dollars. 20…200…I know we had the transportation fund but it was never refilled, and I know why. I was a part of that reason why, so now we're stuck here with losing my LDR, spending 220…4…half…well, half a million dollars on trying to...from my LDR to try to get these existing, and it's not even the new stuff it's the existing stuff I have to deal...this is try to make sure that we have a derelict buildings in the middle of our ward. So, Councillor Gilroy does have a motion coming forward for community committee, which I'm happy it will be…we'll be talking about getting some future investments from the budget working group or the budget. But again, as I'm going through this, I keep hearing different numbers. So my question today is, I know in the budget there was some allocation to help repurpose…I'm not sure how you came up with the number, to repurpose these wading pools. The question is, do you know, is it 30,000 dollars, or is it 45,000 dollars, or is it 40,000 dollars? This is what I still haven't been able to determine, the department is a little unclear as well, so I'm wondering if there could be under advisement, so we can have clarity for all of Council about the few dollars that you'll get from the budget, and so we know how much of our LDR we're going to have to spend to do this.

Councillor Santos: Through you, Deputy Speaker to Councillor Orlikow. Yes, thank you for the question. As you know, as you remember, that he was part of the committee that helped develop the splash pad and wading pool rationalization. At that time, there was a list that was created and was never published on which areas and neighborhoods that were getting splash pads, and a lot of the wading pools that are being converted into splash pads, so as it stands moving forward, the idea is that there would be approximately two to three wading pools that would be decommissioned and one splash pad would be converted...or, it would be converted into a splash pad, and there's moneys that's been set aside in the multi-year budget, 2 million dollars every year, to start on this process and of course, I believe Councillor Orlikow had mentioned that one of his community or one of his wards is getting this type of rationalization. With respect to repurposing or reinvestment or what new investments are going to be put into these spaces now that the wading pools are being decommissioned, it's my understanding within the strategy that there was going to be consultations with the area councillor before the decommissioning of wading pools. That is my understanding and then the funding, you know, whatever number that he has mentioned, I'm not too sure how much the money is when it comes to decommissioning. It could be the structure might be a little bit more, but I can definitely confirm with the department on how much that will cost, but with respect to reinvestments into the community, I think that on-going dialogue with the department and with the Councillor…ward Councillor is very important. And like he had stated, you know, we did create a transformation fund and unfortunately, there's no money into that, so instead, moving forward, we have a significant amount of investments to create new splash pads approximately about 20 million over the next course of the couple of years. So, looking forward to continue to work with Councillor Orlikow on some of his concerns and can get back to him on some clarity on the funding numbers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Chairperson…

Councillor Orlikow: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Orlikow, second question.

Councillor Orlikow: How much are we getting from the last budget? Quite simple question. Is it 30,000 or is it 45,000? If you don't have the answer today, that's fine. I can get it a whole background of…again, but that's my question.
Mr. Deputy Speaker: Chair...Madam Chairperson.

Councillor Santos: Yep, I can definitely get him some more clarity on those.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Do you have a final question? You're good? Anybody else have questions for the Chairperson of Community Services?

Clerk: Seeing none, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No? I'm sorry, say that again.

Clerk: No further questions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No other questions, okay. So, that ends Community Services. We'll now move to the meeting of the Public Works Committee of whatever day that was…whatever…Public Works. Chairperson Lukes to introduce the report, and you will be also speaking to report two. There's an amending motion from yourself, so when you, so…

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED OCTOBER 2, 2024

Councillor Lukes: Correct. I'd like to move Items 1, 3, and 4. Pull Item 2.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: 1, 3, 4, and...

Councillor Lukes: I'm pulling Item 2.

City Clerk: Pull Item 2.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh, okay. Isn't there an Item 6 on there? Pardon me? It's just four. Okay. All the...okay. Does anybody want to pull any of the other ones now? No? I'll call the question then. All those in favour? Is anybody opposed? That is carried. Thank you. Chairperson, Motion 5 and Report No. 2.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Lukes,
Seconded by Councillor Sharma,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 2 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated October 2, 2024, be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendation 5 and replace with the following:*

  "5. That the Accessibility Surcharge fee schedule and collection guidelines be amended as per Appendix 2, effective January 1, 2025, subject to the following amendments:

  A. Under the section titled "Dispatch Company – Taxi", amend the "Accessibility Surcharge - TAXI" fee for 2025 by deleting "0.03" and replacing with "0.07"

  B. In the Notes section, delete the highlighted paragraph and replace with the following:

  "An accessibility surcharge will be charged on every trip (accessible and non-accessible trips) during the month when less than 10% of all registered vehicles for hire of a dispatcher were accessible vehicles for hire demonstrated to have provided transportation services during the month. To count as an accessible vehicle for the purposes of determining the applicability of the accessibility surcharge, the dispatcher must demonstrate that an accessible vehicle provided multiple trips on at least one day per week in the month, was occupied on those days by a driver qualified to provide accessible transportation services, and was available on those days for dispatch to individuals who required accessible transportation services."

- *Add the following new Recommendation 6 and renumber the remaining recommendation accordingly:*

"6. That, subject to the approval of Recommendation 5, the Public Service be directed to review the fees noted in Appendix 2 and report back within two years to determine the long-term sustainability of the Winnipeg WAV program and the related accessibility surcharge."

Councillor Lukes: Okay. So, I have an amendment in front of you that is seconded by Councillor Sharma. Now, I'm going to go through this. It's very complicated, but I'll try to make it simple here, okay? So, we're bringing this amendment forward as a result of ongoing conversations with representatives from the taxi industry. So, the taxi industry is an amazing group of people to work with and deal with and discuss things with and ponder for a while, right? And also, because we've had feedback from Patrick Stewart from the Independent Living Resource Centre. Everyone's concern is to keep the Wave program as successful as it has been these last couple of years ago. So, I'll give you a little bit of history. In 2017, when the City took over regulating this sector, we brought in a fee of seven cents per trip, along with an exemption from the fee if 10 percent of dispatch company vehicles were accessible. So, if dispatchers have 10 percent of their vehicles accessible, they don't pay the fee of seven cents a trip. As of today, two of the largest dispatchers have met the 10 percent rate of accessible vehicles. One of them just recently met it, and just barely. They just have their 10 percent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Six months ago?

Councillor Lukes: Yeah, six months ago, right. So, it took a while, but you know, they're there now. After discussions with the industry and Patrick Boen from the resource centre, we felt it important to keep this pilot program in place for a little while longer just to ensure that these two largest dispatchers, and especially this recent one that came on board, build their fleet of accessible vehicles. So, this led us to further into discussions that we want to keep the 10 percent criteria remaining in place. The report says take it out, but the amending motion, after recent discussions, said keep it in place. So, we've heard the community, we've talked to them. We...we don't believe the 10 percent exemption is needed long-term till the new rates are negotiated with the taxi industry. So, what we're doing is we're formalizing a sustainability review in two years, okay. So, we can look at it in two years' time and see if the, you know, vehicles have built up and if the...you know, the accessible vehicles, the volume are adequate. So, during these two years, the Vehicle-for-Hire staff can continue to consult and assess the impacts. The taxi companies have also been tremendous partners on this, and the exemption also reflects their contribution to the success of the program. So, the current rate of seven…is seven cents per trip, and this report was reducing that to three cents and removing the 10 percent requirement and waiving…and waiving the fee. But the reality of this service is, it's almost exclusively provided by these two large taxi sectors. And the taxi rates, of course, are pre-set by Council. This also reflects the reality that the PPTs; the Ubers, the Lyft companies, they're able to amend their rates at any time. So, it's complicated, but we've worked with the industry, we've worked with Independent Living Resource Centre, we've worked with Grant Heather, who has been amazing at this, and we just felt, let's just keep it in place. The Wave program…the Wave program is being looked at across Canada from many other cities. It's very positive. So, we're going to keep this going for another two years and then during that time, assess…assess as it goes because the goal is to have long-term sustainability. So, that is the amendment. I put it out there for you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Do I have anybody who wants to speak to this?

Clerk: Councillor Schreyer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm sorry. Thank you, Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It's okay, don't worry, Jason.

Councillor Schreyer: So, I was aware in sort of...in the discussions about this, I was aware that there was an amendment coming. My understanding to the amendment when I heard about it was that the main part to my understanding was that there's going to be a two-year exemption. What I did not know, and I still at this moment I'm not sure about, is that the amendment includes a two-year exemption, yet it includes an increase from three cents to seven cents to the accessibility surcharge for taxi. So, there's an increase, but it doesn't start for two years? I just need to understand that for...and I do know that our chair of our standing committee will have a chance to speak again before the vote. And so, I just...I'm hoping for clarification on that. That was not my understanding when I heard about the amendment. So again, just for clarity, before I go forward, before we go forward on this. There's a two-year exemption but the...when the exemption is over, it's increasing from three to seven if that is the case...that's what I'm reading here, and I'll read my understanding. Under the section titled 'Dispatch Company Taxi', "Amend accessibility surcharge taxi fee for 2025 by deleting three cents and replacing with seven cents." That's what I'm reading. I didn't expect that. I wasn't told that in the conversation leading up to this moment. So, at this moment, I am confused, and I don't understand. If we could get clarity on that. And I won't have any ability to ask any further questions about that, and I just hope my question is good enough for a good enough answer that I may vote on this with confidence.

Councillor Lukes: So...

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Well, hang on. No. It's not question period. Hang on. Hang on. Is there anybody else who would like to speak to the amendment and report? There's nobody there?

Clerk: Seeing none, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pardon me?

Clerk: Seeing none.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is nobody? I'm going to...is the dean of council in the room, Mr. Wyatt?

Clerk: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: He can't serve as the Deputy Speaker so I can speak to the report. Councillor Schreyer, please take the Chair until I finish my speech on...Browaty's on EPC, he can't be…he can't preside over the meeting. Nobody from EPC can. You could, Monsieur Allard, but I'm giving Councillor Schreyer...Councillor Wyatt would be the legitimate, but I just gave the Chair to...listen, I make...the Deputy Speaker just made a decision that Councillor Schreyer will take the Chair while I debate.

Councillor Sharma: I am back if you wish.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Well, there is no debate...

Councillor Sharma: Not for that reason, it's coincidental.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Madam Chair, you don't…Madam Chair, let me finish on this report.

Councillor Sharma: Okay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I was the Chair. I put…I don't…you know, listen, Councillor Schreyer is merely in the Chair. He doesn't get to speak. Okay. Alright. So, Councillor Schreyer is in the Chair. He's not on EPC, and so on and so forth. Anyway, I want to speak to the amendment, actually. So...so I...oh, you want to speak to it now? Okay, anyway.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, I'll take the Chair while you speak, if you don't mind. I am back here and then I'll pass it back to you so you can finish this report. Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Alright. Okay, alright. Anyway, okay so let me start off by saying, why was Ross Eadie late to Council? Ross Eadie did a bunch of consultation because I had the foggiest idea of what's going on with this thing, and it wasn't totally, like, described appropriately, I think, in the actual original report from Mr. Heather through Public Works. And it's my understanding that he's been balancing things and he does consult with the industry, as well. He's very good at it, actually, I think. I don't think anybody could challenge him on that. So, I spent my time this morning, instead of getting to eat breakfast, I spent my time trying to figure out what's going on. So, now, I know the industry who meets the 10 percent qualification, that means 10 percent of their dispatchable units are accessible. And one...Unicity had achieved that six months ago. They hadn't before. So, they were paying the extra fee because there's a base ten-cent fee for accessibility on all trips. It doesn't matter. And even on PTPs. Although, I call them personal vehicles for hire. PTP sounds like point of port. Anyway, so now they don't have any accessibles at this point or anything. So, really, they're paying whatever fees are charged. Before this report came down, if you didn't meet the 10...10…how'd it go? You're paying 17 cents, okay? Now Mr. Heather is saying, well, we should reward, some carrots, we should reward those, and we'll reduce it to three cents. Now, the industry says, well, if we meet the 10 percent challenge, we want it zero cents and just pay our 10 cents per trip. Now, Mr. Heather has to fund the accessibility dispatch. That's where the money's coming from, the per trip that people are paying. That's where the money's coming to pay the contractor who's supplying an accessibility dispatch service for all accessible vehicles. And so, what I think this motion is doing now, though, it's making it even worse than what the industry was asking. They wanted to be, if I meet the ten percent, zero extra charge, we just pay the ten cents per trip, every trip, no matter whether it's an accessible vehicle or whatever. So, now we know that the personal vehicles for hire, the so-called PTP, personal transportation, what...I can't remember. The last "P" makes no sense to me. Anyway, personal transport…whatever, anyway. It's a personal vehicle for hire. So, it's my understanding, after this passed that they would be paying 33 cents per trip, not the base ten cents. There was other...would be plus the 17, and then there's whatever. Anyway, the thing is, the Ubers of the world would be paying a better share because they're not accessible. So...which I'm good with. And that's not being changed with the amendment. That's fine. That's still going to move forward.

And I think that's fair for the industry because they also have unfair competitive advantages over dispatchable taxis. Now, I want to go back to just…I don't…I think you should leave it at three percent…three cents. Now, I know the industry doesn't like it, but I heard mention about continuing the accessibility pilot project, but I don't think it's pilot anymore. It was piloted for a year. I think there was a new contract entered into, a two-year contract, I guess, which is why you're saying to evaluate it after two years. But you're putting it back up to seven cents again. So, what you're really doing is penalizing the dispatchable taxi industry for achieving 10 percent of accessible vehicles. Why would you want to do that? Lower the fee down to three cents. So, this…I can't…I'm not going to be voting for the amending motion. I know that the industry doesn't like the original motion, but I'm just saying, what I…what I found out in looking at this...and it is complex. It's like…anyway, it gets…it gets too crazy, but I think we should leave it. Grant Heather made a report, brought it to Public Works, we voted for it. By explanation from Mr. Heather, I'm sure questions were asked. And I don't see any reason to amend it unless...I mean, I like the part of the amendment that talks about...they're talking about evaluating the fee, but I would say evaluating the service rather than evaluating about the fee. That should be happening anyway to make sure Mr....the representative from the ILRC, Patrick, his concerns. I don't know. His concerns are not having to meet 10 percent vehicle accessible. Well, if you just go ahead and lower the seven cents to three cents, it still has to meet the 10 percent vehicle thing. If it doesn't, then you're penalized. That is the stick. Why...when we lower the fee, right, it's...I don't know. I think it's a good thing. Anyway, I'll leave it at that. I'll be voting against the amendment. I was going to vote for the report.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Deputy Speaker, back to you if you'd like to finish this report, you mentioned.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. Are you going to speak to it seconder?

Madam Speaker: I could. I would like to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Alright. I'm back in the Chair as Deputy Speaker. Who else would like to speak to it? I think I heard Councillor Allard.

Councillor Sharma: Yeah, myself, Councillor…Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm at the podium if you don't mind. I was the seconder of this motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh, right. You wanted to speak next?

Councillor Sharma: And Councillor Lukes did introduce it. It is a little complex, as you said.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Sharma, Councillor Sharma, I think I heard Monsieur Allard ask...

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, to you to the…Deputy Speaker, I was simply thanking the Deputy Speaker for informing me why he had chosen to not respect the process.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Go ahead, Councillor Sharma. Councillor Sharma, go ahead.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you. As I mentioned, the Chair of Public Works introduced the amending motion. As you mentioned, Councillor Eadie, it is a bit complex, but what's in front of us, that amending motion, is what I understand the taxi industry supports. We're just reverting back to what has been happening prior to this report coming forward. So, if you have that 10 percent accessible feet…fleet, pardon me, the rate will be reduced. We're reverting back to what they've had this last little while. And they are in support, that's my understanding. The Chair can also share her comments on that when she closes. So, it's something we could have done at the committee, but we just needed to take a little bit more time. Patrick Stewart spoke a little bit to this. The industry wasn't present that particular day at committee, but there has been some conversations since then, I understand, with Grant Heather. So, this amending motion has been worked on with the industry and with Grant Heather. So, I am in support, and I hope councillors in the chamber here support the amending motion, as well. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Alright. Thank you, Councillor Sharma. Are there any other councillors who would like to speak?

Clerk: Seeing none.
Mr. Deputy Speaker: Alright, seeing none, then closing, Councillor…Chairperson Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Okay. I'll try and address both the questions, okay. So, to Councillor Eadie's question, feeling that the seven percent is not good for the industry, what happens is, if you have…if your fleet has 10 percent vehicles accessible, the seven cents per trip is waived. You don't pay it, okay? So, there are other provides out there other than the two large ones that may not have accessible, they would pay the seven cents. But when you've got 10 percent of your vehicles accessible, it's waived, okay? And so, to…

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Companies have 100 percent accessible.

Councillor Lukes: So, to Councillor Schreyer's question, alright? So, to Councillor Schreyer's question, what the original report…what the report originally was going to do was to remove the…you know, you have to have 10 percent, which, you know, maybe some providers may not decide to do the 10 percent, but you'd still pay...you'd pay three…you wouldn't pay three cents a mile, you'd pay per trip. You'd pay three cents a trip. So, it was reducing...it was...it was reducing the cost per trip but taking off the 10 percent. Patrick Stewart was concerned. One of the larger taxi services was concerned that there may not be enough accessible vehicles for the Wave program. So, they wanted to continue it on as was set out. Both large taxi firms wanted to continue it on. Patrick Stewart wanted to continue it on as originally set out for the first two years. So, we're supporting what their needs, what their requests were. The seven cents will be waived for them per trip because they meet the 10 percent. Anyone else that doesn't meet the 10 percent pays the seven cents. That goes to sustainability. But over the next two years, everyone's going to be assessing this and looking at the sustainability for the long-term, hoping that the second provider that just, just barely meets the 10 percent now builds their fleet even a bit more. It's complex.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Well, it's not that…anyway. Okay, thank you. And that's your close? Alright, so I'm going to call the question then on the amending motion. All those in favour? Is anybody opposed? No? I'm still not convinced. I'm voting nay. Okay. But okay, alright. On the main report now. All those in favour? As amended, yeah. That's what I said, yeah. And only the Speaker at the moment is supposed, Clerk. Alright. I think that was the last report...oh, no, we stood down report number...pardon me? Oh, all those opposed to the report, as amended? Okay. That's three nays? Okay. Three nays are okay, right, Madam…Mr. Clerk? Okay. Good. We don't need a count. Okay. Alright. You're recorded in opposition, yeah. As is…as is I. So, I think...was there another report? No, they were all passed. So we're moving into...are there any motions for referral, Mr. Clerk? I didn't check that.

City Clerk: We have Motion 2.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion 2, right. And that's an automatic referral to the Public Works Committee on the issue of...

City Clerk: Transit Plus policy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pardon me?

City Clerk: Transit Plus policy. It's a motion moved by Councillor Gilroy, seconded by yourself. And it's a motion to review the Transit Plus policy and report back within 180 days.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Alright, so that's a referral. And that's it. Moving to...no, I don't think there's any by-laws. You guys seeing any by-laws? No. So, moving to question period for Public Works. Anybody have any questions for the Chair of Public Works?

Clerk: Seeing none.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: None? Okay. Good. Now I will pass the Chair back to our wonderful Speaker who's a lot more organized than the Deputy Speaker at this point in the day.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS The City of Winnipeg should have accessible transit service for those who need it;

AND WHEREAS Transit Plus policies should be reviewed and updated to reflect the changing professional standards in regards to assessment for service delivery;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg must ensure that the eligibility criteria in the Winnipeg Transit Plus policy is consistent with professional occupational standards and ensure that assessment for service is in keeping with physician and occupational therapist standards of practice;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to:

1. *Review the Winnipeg Transit Plus policy and report back within 180 days on any necessary changes to the eligibility criteria for registrants/customers to ensure the requirements reflect necessary changes to the policy as it relates to physician and occupational therapist standards of practice.*

2. *Consult community and professional designation advocacy organizations to ensure the recommended changes to the Winnipeg Transit Plus policy are consistent with current professional standards of practice.*

Madam Speaker: Okay. You did good. Thank you very much. We'll move onto the last committee. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you want to move the report on my behalf, it's the Governance Committee report, three items.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED OCTOBER 10, 2024

Councillor Eadie: Okay. I won't speak to it. Alright. Yes, on your…on your behalf, I'll move the report Items 1 and 2...

Madam Speaker: And 3.

Councillor Eadie: And 3.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour?

Councillor Eadie: Anybody opposed? Oh, sorry, she called the question.

Madam Speaker: Okay. That's carried. Okay, no…yes. Item 2 and 3, I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 1 has been pulled. I think he want to simply be recorded in opposition. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 - Amendment to the Members of Council Code of Conduct By-law 19/2018

Madam Speaker: Okay. Yeah, okay. I'll call the question.

Councillor Eadie: I wanted to speak to this. So, I guess I'll just...

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Eadie: I get to close on the report, right? You just wanted…I moved it. Well, no, I'm going to close on the report.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So you moved the report. Councillor Eadie, speak to the report. Go ahead.

Councillor Eadie: I'm just going to close on the report. I think the amendments that have been proposed and are being moved forward by Council, which they will, are fairly presented. I do have some concerns about the lack of any discussion about public interest, which there is in the...in the FIPPA legislation of the Government of Manitoba, who are also in charge

of the City of Winnipeg's Charter. Anyway, but what's being proposed is fair, I think. And I will continue...even though it gets passed, I will continue to follow my instinct and proper moral ethical judgment, as I always have. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question then. All in favour? Contrary? One recorded in opposition, and that's carried. That concludes our agenda. Councillor Chambers moves adjournment. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Stay for roll call. And if you could stay back for a few minutes, then we'd like to explain the questions that arose earlier today on a certain item. Thank you. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 5:39 p.m.