COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, December 12, 2024

The Council met at 9:45 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 Santos.

ROLL CALL

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

MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We have a leave of absence motion for Councillor Wyatt. Would you please read it into the record?

Moved by Councillor Schreyer,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We have two new pages joining us today. Call the question on that first. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Our two new pages: Renz-Danielle Gatiwan from St. John's High School who resides in the Mynarski Ward and Michael Mashinter from Tech Voc Vocational High School, resides in the Point Douglas Ward. Welcome to you and thank you for serving Council today. We will now move into morning announcements. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And good morning to everyone. Just a few items today. First of all, I wanted to thank everyone who came to the recent Winnipeg 150 City of Winnipeg versus Province of Manitoba hockey game at the Gateway Arena. And thank you to Councillor Browaty for being such a great host. I think all of us enjoyed the game and had a great time. It was friendly competition. All of us enjoyed seeing Councillor Browaty's posterboard in Gateway, which is…not…hasn't been updated in a bit. We all kind of laughed at him about that. So, it's great. And thank you to the Premier and his entire team for their participation, as well. And to all who came, attendees who came to the game were invited to bring a perishable…nonperishable food item for Manitoba Harvest. I'm happy to report that we raised 320 pounds of food. Approximately 592 meals for Manitobans in need. So, thank you so much to all who came out and attended that great event. Speaking of Winnipeg 150, the Manitoba Moose are hosting a Winnipeg 150 game on December the 22nd. That's a Sunday afternoon. I am not able to attend, but I think Councillor Markus Chambers is going to be there I think to drop the puck or at least to be the host in the arena on behalf of all of Council. All of Council is invited, excuse me, to join in. It's going to be a great afternoon featuring the history of Winnipeg, displays and videos along with some hockey…great hockey, of course. And to celebrate Winnipeg 150, the Moose are offering all City of Winnipeg employees and their families discounted tickets. So, tickets are available now and so maybe you want…everyone wants to take advantage of that. Yesterday the City of Winnipeg rolled out its 2025 preliminary balance budget update. This update represents the hard work of many people over many, many months, including, of course, our Budget Working Group. And I want to thank Councillor Jeff Browaty for leading that process. Thank Councillor Matt Allard and Councillor Evan Duncan as well. And certainly, a moment to express appreciation to our Chief Financial Officer, Tracy Graham, and her dedicated staff for all of their work. The budget focuses on what Winnipeggers have been telling us, what we've been hearing from

Winnipeggers, they want better roads, safer neighbourhoods and responsible financial planning. And so, following a period for all city councillors and the public to review the preliminary budget update. There's public meetings to hear delegations and to consider all the changes…or any changes that may take place. The budget vote date is set for January 29th, 2025. For more information on the 2024 to 2027 multi-year balanced budget process, the public can visit Winnipeg.ca for more information and to learn more about the budget or to register to appear as a delegate at one of the appropriate upcoming meetings. And finally, today as we gather for our final Council meeting of 2024, I want to take a moment to reflect, certainly, on the season that is before us as well. However you are celebrating the holidays, they really do become a time to reflect. Hopefully a time to gather together with those that are important to you, your loved wins. A time for renewal, as well. So, whether you celebrate Christmas or Hanukkah, Kwanzaa or other cherished traditions, the season does remind us of the importance of family and community and the importance of giving back, as well. Here in our city, you know, I just take this moment to reflect on the fact that we do have a diverse and very vibrant city where many cultures and faiths come together to enrich our community. And it's in that spirit that I want to extend my warmest wishes for a joyful holiday season to everyone across our city. To our Council and City staff, thank you for your dedicated work to make Winnipeg a better place each day and every day. And so, to everyone, may this season bring all of you and your loved ones a time to rest and recharge and connect with family and friends. And, you know, as per Councillor Santos' prayer today; let's carry the hope and the kindness of the season into the new year as we continue to work together on behalf of the citizens we serve. So, to all of you, Merry Christmas, Happy Hannukah, happy holidays to you and your family. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to say, especially on behalf of Councillor Eadie, as well as many…as well as, I'm going to say, all of us, I just want to thank Don Windsor. Today is his last day. Running our communications live out of the council chamber and providing that live feed to the people of Winnipeg for years. And been very grateful for his professionalism and his consistency. I believe it's an unfortunate that he is leaving. Today is his last Council meeting. But I'm very grateful for what he has done for us and for the people of Winnipeg working here at city hall with us. And in a sense, there will always be a legacy that which our communication system here has learned working with him as well as what he has passed down for future generations. A perfect example is his daughter Lisa Windsor who has…you would have seen her here over the years, occasionally helping out. And maybe you know Lisa Windsor as being the lead singer at both Winnipeg Jets games and Winnipeg Blue Bomber games, which is pretty big when it comes to national communication and our national customs. There you go. Hey there, that's right. Lisa Windsor was our council live band first with…backed up by her dad, Don. I just want to wish Don well. And I know that we will see him again. And all the best. Thank you. Megwich. On behalf of, of course, other councillors, including Sherri Rollins who is…can attest to his contribution here and his family. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer.

MINUTES

Councillor Chambers moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on November 19, 2024 and November 21, 2024, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move into delegations. First up is David Grant who is appearing remotely on a number of items as listed on the delegations page of our agenda today. David Grant, welcome.

DELEGATIONS

David Grant: Good morning. Thank you. And it was nice being unmuted a few seconds early. Very nice today. In this special season, I invite everyone who needs to get their car home safely from a party to call Operation Red Nose. We take calls till 3:00 a.m., so please stay safe. It's a free service run by community volunteers and we would like to end the carnage of impaired driving. Anyway, moving on. What's happened here? Anyway, on topic…Governance one. I am against waiting another 60 days. And because there is…there are rules here, we can (inaudible) on the delay. These changes should happen now, there's no reason not to. And expert third…for those who aren't aware, an expert third-party was paid to review what Council does. They recognized that current rules make it too easy to ignore public comment. I face this regularly. Instead of taking the good advice of this consulting…consultant company and fixing the problem, city hall has made changes to make this problem far worse. New rules forbid comment if any of a list of conditions apply. More than three years ago, MMP, the company, said that delegations should be an integral part of your decision making. Is there a reason that Council has ignored the MMP report? Beyond the obvious, it is currently easy to ignore all that public

comment. On services topic two: short-term rentals and the rules. This six-month delay is unfortunate, but it can be put to good use. You should ask staff to change this request. Have any of you asked why Winnipeg is waging war on STRs when longer term rentals are the real problem in our communities? The community association that I lead says that longer term rentals are a big problem. Please direct your attention to real problems. This is clearly…the STR problem is part of the prime minister's war on homeowners. Have you seen his tweet vowing to take the keys for all of the 200,000 STRs in Canada? He clearly boasted that Canada's city councils would act as his henchmen, and that's a powerful word, but that's what's out there, in this scheme. I could see that hotels might lobby for this, as some say that an STR competes with a hotel room. But Mr. Trudeau has clearly taken ownership of the battle against STRs. On topic seven…EPC seven: innovation. If someone tells you that doing the ordinary is amazing, you should be a bit skeptical. Ask why are they misleading them. Many of these topics are purely aspirational, i.e. wishful thinking. Pretending to use AI is simply to kick this down the road. Any competent person can do this. It should be simple for staff to compare the purpose of a by-law, such as the one limiting front driveway parking to two vehicles, with its original purpose. Even better would be to create small working groups of volunteers to review the efficacy of short list of by-laws and report. Ten such working groups could complete this task in a matter of weeks at minimal cost. Done right, this process will result in rescinding of the most worthless by-laws. On topic eight: single source buying, in other words, noncompetitive spending. This city spends more of our money in this way than any organization of which I have been associated with. Since value and efficacy cannot be assessed on most of this spending, current rules should be considered the minimum. Deviation and waivers which move far from purchasing norms should be avoided. Our audit team should report on value and efficacy in single source spending. Some say that city hall is heading in new and dangerous directions. Spending tens of millions with no clear plans based on interviews is a practice that would raise alarms with auditors everywhere. When a big job is partly done, but a new aspect is needed, as happens with water plants and so, should all prudent spending rules be ignored? Why do those running city finances seem okay with these exemptions? Why are local media silent? Anyway, moving on onto the former Kapyong lands, on topic nine. For years we have been told that many new homes will be built on this former military base. The land is open, already clear, it seems ready. The topic…the public has seen the plans showing apartments here and nice curvy roads there. Will we be forced by the current owners to wait 10 more years? The City and Ottawa say the need for homes is urgent. Did they make a huge error by not including stage completion dates in the contract to hand over this land? This project must follow many, many pages of consultation rules. Respect for all who dissent could easily delay first occupancy of this land by a decade. Since Ottawa no longer owns the land, it may be too late to speed things up. Does the City have any influence over the joint committee? We're on the committee, maybe we could instill the urgency. And for 12 years, just on something else that's been in the works for a long time, hopefully the topic nine happens sooner. For 12 years, the City has not permitted the building of about 2,000 homes near Parker Avenue. There are other large tracts of land across Winnipeg, including Kapyong, that should have homes built on them. Why are local media silent? If we need more homes, why not simply approve permits for the projects already fully engineered? This reminds me of the problems that were in the headlines in 2010, 2012. It's not new. When a few folks in approval fail to do their job in timely manner. Until a councillor stepped in, it was common for a subdivision to wait over a year for a simple permit. Why have all the failures to issue permits not been investigated by the City Auditor? Everyone says we need more homes now, but we seem to be doing nothing…doing nothing on those shovel ready projects. HAD topic 10, EPC 10. I'm very much against this and how this project and 15 of its fellow proposals are being…may be adopted without any deliberation. I suggest that this is abuse of the consent agenda process and violates good business and governance rules. In the old days, consent agenda was when you were doing a nominal approval of somebody to stay on a committee for another year, i.e. put all that list in the consent and not have to talk about routine stuff. In this case, these are not routine matters. Do all of you agree that making massive changes in the liveability of our neighbourhoods is not worth two minutes of your time to actually deliberate on these topics. We see here tens of millions of tax dollars handed to for-profit homebuilders. Some of us see this as a violation of the public trust. Many believe that more new homes would now have families in them if the HAF had never been proposed. I remember a person saying it was housing decelerator fund a few years ago. In so many ways, the report says that HAF has failed. Some HAF rules went against public interest and you've recognized that before. Initially, many of us believe that the HAF money would support building of homes by paying for city infrastructure to support the building of those homes. We were told that it would help, not so. It seems that none of Ottawa's money will cover the City's out of pocket costs in the field, such as sewer and waterlines. More than…worse than that, the City will not even collect the full municipal taxes that normal developments produce. Another world…word of HAF suggests urgency. That affordable homes would be ready sooner. The opposite seems to be true. We are years into this program. I would suggest that a greenfield development could have been done and produced homes sooner at lower costs to our neighbourhoods. And certainly, the development of apartments and houses has happened faster in previous years. And we'll skip some of that. But moving on to water. Water topic one. In this item, the City is heading in a very wrong direction. Some of the…some of the actions of this committee will not reduce the city's greenhouse gas production. There is a need to audit and evaluate every eco step proposed in terms of its percent, net and GHD reduction and cost. Trying to convince the public that a useless step is wonderful does a disservice to everyone. Please stop this spin campaign. Instead, an objective analysis of every City-funded green plan should be performed as soon as possible. Water topic three. There is a myth that Manitoba can generate usable power based on heat sources deep under the city. We have no magma resources, this cannot happen. This myth is as fake as the 24-year-old method; Manitoba can make so much hydrogen from our electricity that we can replace all the fossil-fuel in Alberta. That spread around for a year, but it was completely untrue. The truth is that

Alberta's energy is more than 10 times as abundant as ours. We can use large amounts of electricity to cool homes by pumping summer heat into the ground, and that's a good thing, but no one can use 10 degree C soil underground to make electric power. EERP: Economic recovery. After closing so many eateries, bars and small businesses in 2020 in response to the misinformation of the day, city hall wanted to create jobs. This is noble and good. This program has gone terribly astray, I suggest. Upgrading our wastewater infrastructure with that money would have created good jobs and left a legacy of a cleaner lake and river. Most of the projects involved in this EERP…

Madam Speaker: David? David, are you just wrapping up? That concludes the time allotted. You're just wrapping up?

David Grant: If I could have three seconds. Three sentences.

Madam Speaker: Yes. Yes.

David Grant: Thank you. Most of these projects provide no tangible benefit to residents or nature. They do not replace the jobs lost in the dark days of lockdown. It would have been more fair if the millions had been devoted to reversing the harm done by the lockdowns. Putting this money into a tax holiday for the small eateries would have been just. What was done is not that just. And like the Federal Small Business Program, public sympathy morphed into what some call a waste of money. And thank you very much for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, David. Thank you for your presentation. There's no questions today. Next, we have Kate Kehler appearing remotely. Executive Director of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg in opposition to Item 2 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works, the report dated November 29th, 2024. It's regarding Arlington Street Bridge over the CPR Yards Rehabilitation Feasibility and Preliminary Design Study. Kate, welcome.

Kate Kehler: Good morning, everybody. As…everybody can hear me alright? Wonderful, thank you. So, as always, my apologies to the EPC members because some of you will have heard me…heard this from me already, or a lot of it, at least. And I am sure most of you have heard a lot of this before, as well. However, we are here at a particular moment and the train has changed somewhat on Arlington Bridge and rail relocation. I do feel that I need to put some additional important context on my remarks today. You all will have received a copy of the latest Campaign 2000 report card on child and family poverty in Manitoba. It demonstrates that in 2022, there were unacceptable rates of poverty in every federal riding in the city of Winnipeg. However, as today we are discussing Arlington Bridge replacement, I will focus on Winnipeg centre and north. Winnipeg centre remains the urban federal riding with the highest rates of child and family poverty across Canada. It has a full 41 percent and Winnipeg north is at 32 percent. These numbers have not really varied much since we began these report cards some 30 years ago. And child and family poverty was not new then. The rates, especially in these two ridings, had always been high. And while this latest report is based on 2022 data, no one expects that, when available, 2024 will be any better. My point is that child and family poverty is entrenched and unless a bold vision and steps are taken at all levels of governments that are truly transformative, it is going to remain entrenched. I'm representing a coalition today of Indigenous, newcomer, labour, environmental organizations, academics, community-based researchers and advocates that continues to work towards a feasibility study for rail…rail removal. Please note that I say rail removal and not just rail yard removal. We used…we used to be able to list active transit membership in our coalition, but the revised report on bridge replacement changed that. It cannot be characterized as a friendly breakup as it was not really a breakup. We will continue to work together on what we agree on. And we do agree that the ability to cross at-grade at multiple access points is better than a bridge. We also agree that rail removal, as in rail lines, should also open up green corridors throughout the city. We hope we agree that when it comes to rebuilding the bridge versus rail removal, it's…we are not at that point yet. We do agree…I mean it that it is not an either/or at this point. Sorry. We do agree that at least according to this most recent City report that the existing bridge has to come down. Safety is a core tenant of our coalition, as well for the active transit supporters. Where we differ is what should happen beyond the bridge coming down. Much work has already been done by the City on replacing Arlington Bridge. Different studies, reports, community consultations, etcetera, when little to no investment has been made on rail relocation. We have some statements of support from some on Council, but also, real opposition. My point being today is to ask for a bit of fairness and allow the rail relocation feasibility study proponents time, if not resources, to catch up. Province has come to the table. Federal matching funds are still available, but may not be if there's a change of government at that level. So, we are very highly motivated to get things moving on a rail feasibility study. Some other points for you to consider; according to a recent Winnipeg Free Press article, 63 percent of Manitobans, and at 68 percent in Winnipeg are in favour of rail removal, but 73 percent of Manitobans doubt it will happen and that that is due to cost and having this subject come up time and time again. People are getting excited and then governments refusing to invest. On cost, we simply don't know what that will be as far as rail relocation goes. Sure, we can compare with other jurisdictions, but we also need to then compare the economic benefits those other jurisdictions have reaped. That is what a feasibility study will do. We are also years out from some other rail locations. There are undoubtedly lessons to be learned. There are potential newer technologies such as geothermal capacity that could be built in…that will benefit the city for far longer than a bridge could. Again, I do have…I don't have the details, but a feasibility study would. At 193 million, that's the 166 plus the interest, but if we have to increase

the debt ceiling to get there, couldn't that interest be more? Also, that's the cost of replacement of Arlington Bridge to-date. We all know that, obviously, large infrastructure projects can go off, they can go over budget, and of course, the same could be true for rail relocation. However, spending on a measure that was needed but may not…needed in the day, that may no longer be necessary does not make sense at this time. We also have to remember that the estimated cost is lower because…lower than the previous estimate of over 300 million because it would be back on to two lanes for cars. They were traffic issues when the bridge was open. The bridge alleviated traffic issues, it didn't resolve them. Everything we do to make travelling by car as easy as possible will mean people will just continue to travel by car and that is not where we should be moving as a city for everyone's sake given the environmental impact. So, our coalition has said, as well as others, we can choose to look at this point in time the closure as either a crisis or an opportunity. One potential opportunity, and I am not an engineer, so I don't know how to take a bridge down, but I'm assuming there will be some disruption of operations at the existing yards. If so, some sort of temporary work around will be needed. So, perhaps CPCK could take the opportunity to consider a permanent work around. And, of course, we have Centreport. Centreport offers a more efficient, multi-modal integrated alternative to existing rail yards. It combines proximity to Richardson Airport and many key trucking companies with links to east and west coast markets. It can also link by rail the Churchill shipping port for shorter routes to Europe. Job loss concerns. Obviously, whatever option we pick, there is going to be a huge temporary creation of jobs in the construction, the demolition, all of that work. All of those, that's going to be for either project, will be present. But long-term job loss at the yard could easily be replaced with expanded opportunities at Centreport. I do want to conclude, though, by once again emphasizing health and safety. There are 240 rail yard crossings within city limits. The existing rail lines and crossings affect city development and planning. They also are a safety concern. On April 30th, 2022, there was a train and motor vehicle collision at the Letellier crossing. On January 15th, 2023, train and motor vehicle collision at Beaverhill Boulevard. Massive volumes of hazardous material routinely travel through densely populated Winnipeg neighbourhoods. Derailments and spills can and have happened. Most recently, April 21, 2023, 12 Canadian Pacific cars carrying undiluted bitumen slipped off the tracks on a CPR overpass above McPhillips Street between Logan and Jarvis. The environmental impacts of the noise, particulate and diesel pollutions are constant…are a constant burden on the health of those living in Winnipeg's downtown and core areas. The benefits of removing these sources of pollution should not be underestimated. But again, 75 percent of Winnipeggers live within 800 meters of rail line. So, this is not solely about north and south. If something has to be moved on, as you move forward in this…as we consider the budget going forward, you have more answers from the Province, the debt ceiling discussion happens, then move on the bridge demolition and let rail location catch up with feasibility studies so we can really contrast and compare what would be best for Winnipeg now, the near future and the far future. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thanks, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, in listening to the presentation, I find it interesting and I'm wondering if the delegation understands the irony of…the bridge is something that the people living in poverty in the North End and the West End and central, that's…you know, they use bikes and they are living in poverty, they're walking a lot. Do you understand the irony of talking about poverty for kids and not providing the ability for people living in poverty to utilize our streets in a fashion that is accessible for them?

Kate Kehler: I don't believe that is the point I made at all, Councillor Eadie. Or sorry, Madam Speaker, through the Speaker. I guess I would have to ask clarity on what that's meant by irony. We are actually talking about potential of building a complete community where those rail yards actually exist that will actually benefit people living in poverty far more than a bridge will.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I'm wondering if the delegation…in the big vision, if the delegation has ever thought that that rail line that runs east-west could be a great LRT, as they did in Edmonton. I believe they used the former rail line to do the north part of their LRT, which was built in the 1980s.

Kate Kehler: Yes, I am aware of that. And I know you've mentioned this as a potential better future suggestion. I have lived in areas that have light rail. And kind of factitiously is that it's like light beer; it's got less calories, but it's not necessarily healthier. It will stay…it won't do anything to take away from the north-south divide, which rail…rail yard relocation will. So, I am not quite sure why we would just want to replace light rail with that.

Madam Speaker: Final question, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I would like it…little explain more. I don't believe the railway creates a north and south differential in the city. Could you please go into further detail how bringing the railway through that area has done that because I don't understand.

Madam Speaker: Kate.

Kate Kehler: It is simply that there are minimal access points, minimal crossing points between north and south. Whereas, if the rail yards were not there, there would be multiple access points throughout. There wouldn't be this idea that we have to congest at certain crossing points in order to go back and forth.

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

Councillor Schreyer: I want to thank Kate Kehler for her comments, for her advocacy. And I did learn something today, as well from her delegation. I do have a question, though. At one point, I heard a lot of the term moving the rail line and I was wondering if you meant the rail line. Then later, you said at the end, twice: rail yards. And so, I just wanted clarity on that, because there's a big difference. But I understand, they surely are related. And if there is any further clarification you can make in terms of when you meant rail line and rail yards.

Kate Kehler: Thank you very much. And let me…yes, just a little bit distracted. I have another meeting going on. So, I apologize if I used 'yard' when I meant 'lines'. The overall point for today, though, is that the coalition that I am representing here today is actually for complete rail removal however that looks, whenever that can be. Everybody understands there would be a staged approach. But we are here today because of the report on replacing Arlington Bridge. And the concern is, if we spend up to 200 million dollars to replace Arlington Bridge, there is going to be very little desire or very little push in order to actually take away the yards. And they are incredibly dangerous. The people who live around those yards do want them gone. We do have people from the North Point Douglas Association on our coalition. They live in that area and they are affected daily. Their health and wellbeing is affected daily by those yards.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, we will move to the next delegation. Thank you, Kate. Or Councillor Eadie?

Kate Kehler: Thank you all very much.

Madam Speaker: Kate, just a moment, question by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Yes, Madam Speaker, do…I am wondering if the delegation knows how far away north Point Douglas is from the CPKC railyards which start west of the Slaw Rebchuck Bridge. Do you understand that?

Kate Kehler: Yes, thank you. If I misused the term, again, I'm a little bit distracted. But we…I am sorry, we do have members from that coalition who are extremely concerned about the yard. So, I don't want to go too much. I don't want to say too much in there. But they are on our coalition and they want the yards gone. So, I am not quite sure, again, what the point is with the councillor. There are people who live around that area and they are impacted by the health and safety. There has been a report that was put out by the Eco Network on the conditions that are around the rail yards and they are affecting people's health and well-being.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Kate. Have a good day. Our next…our next delegation is Tim Fennell of Bike Winnipeg in support of Item 4 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated November 24th. It's regarding the Speed Limit Reduction on Wellington Crescent. Welcome.

Tim Fennell: Thank you. Thank you everyone for having me. Thank you, Mayor Gillingham, and every…all the members of Council. I just want to introduce myself; I am River Heights resident. I live on Cambridge Street. I have a wife that works at St. Mary's Academy which is near the area that we are talking about. And we walk to and from there on a daily basis. She walked there today. My kids attend Robert H Smith and River Heights School and they also walk to and from…and to and from daycare. And I am also a stage four cancer patient. And I, as part of my recovery, walk all over the neighbourhood. I walk along Wellington Crescent. And I…our family, as a whole, values the walkability of our neighbourhood, including Wellington Crescent. Before I get too far into things, I have a few concepts I think we should raise and just consider. The one first is called moral hazard, okay. And this refers to a situation where a party or person lacks the incentive to guard against risk due to being protected by potential consequences. Moral hazard, okay. So, refers to a situation where a party or person lacks the incentive to guard against risk due to being protected from any potential consequences. The next one is integrity and that's the quality of being honest and having strong moral principles and moral uprightness. It is more than just following rules. It is having principles and standing by them. Moral hazard can be overcome by leaders with integrity. Moral hazard can be overcome by leaders with integrity. And I would like to think that all of the leaders here today have integrity. In July 2021…sorry, 2022, Council unanimously approved the Road Safety Strategic Action Plan. And that is an important detail to remember. Unanimously, all the seats in this room approved that motion. That motion has all kinds of things about vision zero, being proactive, reducing speeds, saving lives. It had all kinds of information about the current death rates of pedestrians and cyclists, which are abnormally high. In my experience

with cancer, I spent some time walking the neighbourhood and I noticed something that I hadn't really noticed before because having cancer changes your perspective, it changes some of your priorities. And it became clear to me that there was something very wrong with River Heights. And it started me down a path of working with my neighbours to lobby to try and calm our street. And that experience led us to, you know, team up together, reach out to our councillor and get our neighbours to also call our councillor and that was leading up to the election. And our councillor made it clear on his website, he said…and he also handed out flyers to our street. "I understand and share your concerns and look forward to working with the neighbourhood in addressing the issue." I look forward to addressing the issue. I reached out to Public Works for data about our street. And for some reason our street didn't have information on the open data portal about traffic. So, we had to explore that. We knew that our councillor had some of that information and we reached out to him and asked for it. And we were told that that was private information. So, we had to submit a FIPPA request for that and we worked on that. We found out that there was a traffic study done in 1994 that was very politically contentious. We hear that many times. So, we asked for a copy of that from city hall, but we were denied that. We submitted a FIPPA request for that, denied again. And finally had to go to the ombudsman. Finally, after a year of going…messaging back and forth, I was granted with a meeting with my councillor to talk about the issue face-to-face. I got 30 minutes. 30 minutes, not a minute more. I was escorted out. And my point here today when I raise this issue is, this is…this is a fight that we have to really push for and we shouldn't have to. The default here should be safety. You all voted for safety. And this is what we want. And we can all agree that that's what we want because we voted for it. So, let's…let's make it safe, okay? If we were to flip this around and say, okay, all the roads are 30. All the roads 30 now and if you want it to be 50, you have to prove that it is safe. Would some of the residents on Wellington Crescent who want to save tens of seconds driving to their home, would they be able to come and stand up here and prove to you that driving faster is safe for my kids? Would you be okay with them throwing my kids under the bus? Because that is what you are doing.

Councillor Mayes: Madam Speaker, the delegate registered in favour. The decision of EPC was not to proceed with a lower speed limit. Thus, I would assume he is speaking in favour of that since he registered in favour. I am not getting that flavour from his comments.

Madam Speaker: Tim, you did in fact register in support of the recommendation.

Tim Fennell: Yes, I am in support.

Madam Speaker: Okay, let's stick to the report that's in front of us. Thank you.

Councillor Mayes: Be then not proceeding with the lower speed limit at this time. That was what was in the EPC three to two vote.

Madam Speaker: Are you aware of that, Tim? The recommendation at the Executive Policy Committee is different than what came out of the Public Works Committee.

Tim Fennell: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Alright, so you are speaking in support of the recommendation from the Executive Policy Committee?

Tim Fennell: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Great. Okay.

Time Fennell: No.

Madam Speaker: You've registered incorrectly. Do you want to continue?

Tim Fennell: Sorry. I'm registered for safer streets in Winnipeg. Are you saying that making it 50 is not safe?

Madam Speaker: Tim, if you want to continue with your…with your…are you almost finished your presentation?

Tim Fennell: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So, it would be…you had registered in support of the item, but you are, in fact, in opposition of what's coming, likely, from the Executive Committee. So, you've registered incorrectly, but let's continue…just continue and please wrap up your presentation.

Tim Fennell: Okay, sorry. I…

Councillor Mayes: I already had people complain to me saying, look, four people have registered on this. We are limited to four people. So, if four people really are in opposition, but two of them say they are in favour and then get up and say, actually, I am in opposition, it kind of destroys the integrity of the process if we're going to talk about integrity.

Councillor Rollins: Indicating and I don't know. But he maybe indicated that the majority of the motion he favours, save for the one spot. And so, that…he registered in support, may be his point.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Tim, speak to the report in front of you. Are you familiar with what came out of Executive Committee?

Tim Fennell: Yeah.

Madam Speaker: Okay, and you are in support of the recommendations, as presented?

Tim Fennell: Yeah, I'm in support of making efforts to make it safety for…safer Wellington Crescent… I'm sorry I didn't…I didn't talk about this...

Madam Speaker: Tim, when you address Council, it will be through the Chair.

Tim Fennell: It's not clear to me what I said that wasn't in support of the issue.

Madam Speaker: The recommendations that came out of the Executive Policy Committee are different than what came out of the Public Works Committee. It sounds to me you are speaking to what came out of the Public Works Committee.

Tim Fennell: Yeah.

Madam Speaker: Okay. And that is not what you are registered for today. So, if you want to just take a few minutes and wrap up, I think we've got your point. We certainly do. Okay.

Tim Fennell: Okay. So, my point is, we as a committee have supported the action of being proactive to solve these issues in our city and we should be doing it. And it shouldn't be a few people in our neighbourhood that are preventing these things from moving forward. We should be reaching out and listening to the community at-large and listening to their voices. And if we had the same zeal to listen to our constituents about roadway safety as we do the Housing Accelerator Program, we would probably hear more of those voices of support.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Tim. Thank you for your presentation. Next I'll call Mark Cohoe, Executive Director of Bike Winnipeg, in support of the same item. There's five minutes. Mark, I want to confirm, you are in support of the recommendations that came out of the Executive Committee?

Mark Cohoe: Yeah, I am in support of the four clauses that were passed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Mark Cohoe: So, I want to say thanks for the opportunity to speak. Bike Winnipeg supports the motion to have the Public Service begin work on interim long-term designs towards development of a safe, comfortable bike route along Wellington Crescent. As I'm sure you know, Wellington Crescent has been identified as a key route in the city of Winnipeg's cycling network. More than 20 years, and in fact, even the 1993 study of the…which, to be honest, I have never seen. Shows that this is a route, south Assiniboine bike route that's spoken of. You know, we have had plenty of studies and feedback on this, including the Osborne Village Transportation Overview, the Osborne Village Neighbourhood Plan, Corydon-Osborne Plan, the 2015 Pedestrian Cycling Strategies. Calls in OurWinnipeg 2045 to move towards a sustainable transportation to make sure that we are encouraging more and more people to walk, to bike and to take transit as a key goal in our climate action plan to make sure we're moving and shifting that mode of transportation over so that we are taking on some of our climate responsibilities. You know, you have heard over 50 plus delegates have come forward and spoken in passion about some of the fears that they face as they are on Wellington Crescent, as they are moving through that. So, I think it's…you know, it is important that we recognize that there is action that needs to be taken on Wellington Crescent. If we are to encourage people to walk, to bike, to have that access to transit, we need to be making changes to the road design that we have there. We don't want to repeat the tragedies that have happened in the past. And I think, you know, we are all committed to that. Certainly, this motion takes on the challenges and the task at-hand to build our network and make the road safer and more comfortable. And I think it's working constructively to encourage shift in transportation mode. And you know, if we don't encourage that shift, you know, some of the fears that we have seen come up with respect to Wellington Crescent about shifting, you know, traffic off Wellington onto other streets, we are going to see that. You know,

if we don't move and work towards reducing the amount of drivers that we have, the amount of vehicles, to have those options open, our streets are going to become clogged and we're going to run into problems. Certainly, I think it is important to move forward with this. You know, I think it is also important for us to realize that as we move forward with our pedestrian and cycling strategies, innovation is going to be a part of this. You know, not necessarily something that's out of the realm here. We don't have to be the first place in the world to do it. But certainly, for the Winnipeg context, we are going to have to be embracing different strategies, different designs that we have in the past and different norms that we have in the past. So, I think it is important that we keep that open mind. It is going to be important towards projects throughout the city, whether it's the northwest hydro corridor as we move into, you know, a more dense grid network to make sure we have safe crossings on that. So, I really do encourage you. You know, I think you have years and years of study saying this is an important route. Certainly, you know, I think, you know, through that process through City Centre, through Public Works, through EPC, I've been clear, I would have preferred 30-kilometers an hour to be that interim. You know, but it's important to get this motion forward. And it's my understanding we'll have those opportunities. And I encourage you to review when you get the chance on that 30K, if you are not moving forward. But certainly, you know, it really puts that pressure on you to move forward on this then if we are not creating that immediate interim step, we need to have something in place that will create that change in attitude, that change in comfort level moving forward. You know, we can make these changes to Wellington Crescent. And you know, it's important that we do if we want to meet our goals. So, I think I've got 17 seconds. So, I will leave it there. I'm happy to take any questions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Questions? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. I guess you could see there was some confusion here in the circle, including…oh, they're right on record, our Speaker as well as Councillor Mayes trying to understand where you are coming from in delegations specifically to the motion in terms of whether you are for or against. So, you're…you encourage us to vote for the recommendation from EPC today, is that because it's a compromise or was there an amendment that was made to it that allows you to speak in favour today? That is obviously not what happened the other day at the standing committee. Could you enlighten us, I think it would help quite a few of us.

Mark Cohoe: Sure. Well, my…well, I was at that EPC meeting. So, I certainly watched it. So, as you are hopefully aware at that meeting, the resolution that came from Public Works that had five clauses was voted on individually. Certainly, at the time, you know, there was discussion about having a chance to vote on these in the future and change our minds. Four of those clauses moved forward to this. I am not 100 percent sure on the process when something doesn't pass at the EPC where it moves. It is my understand it doesn't move forward to this Council to vote on, so that, in essence, the four motions that were passed at EPC then are the ones we are speaking to. And it's those motions that I am in favour of.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. So, you weren't in favour of all five at the beginning? Just for clarification.

Mark Cohoe: Oh, for clarification, I was in favour of all five. Certainly, I was. That was the presentation I made at City Centre, at Public Works and at EPC.

Councillor Schreyer: So, you're accepting this as a reasonable compromise, four to five, for you to support today?

Mark Cohoe: I'm accepting this as what I have moving forward. Would I prefer 30-kilometers an hour? Yes, absolutely. And you know, I certainly do hope that we will reinvestigate this if a decision is made not to move forward with 30-kilometers an hour. I think there are reports coming, as you know. I think we are…we're aware. And you know, I am hopeful. You know, I would remind you, as well, that the study on the 30-kilometer an hour neighbourhoods, the 40-kilometer an hour neighbourhoods, is designed in a way that doesn't allow interventions, right? It's specifically set out to not have interventions, so not have any…any kind of infrastructure or encouraging program that would sort of try and move beyond just the speed limit to reduce peoples' speeds. Obviously, as the City moves forward with its strategy, whatever it takes, it would have options for mitigation, for…and encourage…and for education that weren't part of that. And it's probably, I understand, some of those recommendations will be in that 30…40 speed reduction neighbourhood plan.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the questions. That concludes your presentation, Mark. Thank you. Next is Hillary Rosentreter in opposition to Item 4 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated November 29th. Same topic, Speed Limit Reduction on Wellington Crescent. Welcome.

Hillary Rosentreter: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Hello, good morning. My name is Hillary Rosentreter and I use she/her pronouns. I'm very grateful to be able to speak here to Council and the Mayor today in opposition to Item No. 4 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated November 29th, 2024 – Speed Limit Reduction on Wellington Crescent. As I'm sure you can tell from the title, the original intent of the motion was to make Wellington

Crescent as safe as possible for all users as quickly as possible with a speed limit reduction. In the motion's current form, it is promising, but there is room for improvement. Namely, amending the motion to include the reduction of Wellington Crescent speed limit to 30-kilometers per hour. I am here before you today not even 24 hours after hopping off a plane from a 15-hour journey and two weeks away from home because I firmly believe it is possible for this Council to make the right decision today. I would appreciate your attention over the next eight minutes before the jetlag gets to me. I'm aware a number of those on Council know about our online community of Winnipeg residents connected by our appreciation for all things related to the bicycle, but our community goes well beyond that. Because every single person, many of them up there beside me, I am fortunate to call my friend from this group is deeply passionate about the safety of people, the health of our planet and the environment and the long and short-term best interests of this city we call home. I have been so fortunate to have the chance to live outside of Canada for half of my adult life, but I always love to brag about Winnipeg being where I want to be and where we ultimately bought a house. The common refrain is the city has good bones. Incredible potential. But to really help you understand why I am at this podium today I need to take you back in time six months to June 6th, the day Rob Jenner was killed. Already before lunch that day, our online community's main message thread was ablaze over news about a cyclist being hit by driver along Wellington Crescent earlier in the morning and taken to hospital in critical condition. We were anxious and devastated. To be honest, we were also angry. We were desperate for more information. Our group has many residents of Councillor Orlikow's, Councillor Rollins and Councillor Gilroy's wards. They use Wellington Crescent as their daily commute because it's their only choice, being right at their doorstep. They know better than anyone that that beautiful right-of-way hides dark secrets among the cracks in its narrow sidewalks, the unmarked pedestrian crosswalks, the width of four lanes and the frequent speeders along the crescent. They would be the first to tell you that Rob's death was an inevitability. Even though Rob was among the most cautious cyclists, he is not with us today. But at the time, the reality was that even though we were trying to figure out who had been hit, it didn't really matter. A person was in critical condition and later succumbed to their industry…injures caused by being hit from behind at a fatal speed. Rob's death was entirely preventable. And to be clear, I'm not here because of a reckless driver. Rob's death, as I said, was preventable and I can promise you nearly every single person who walks or bikes along Wellington Crescent has a harrowing story of a few near-death experiences. I am here today because one death is too many and change needs to happen. I am grateful to Councillor Rollins and Councillor Lukes for bringing forward this motion and look forward to others, especially Councillor Santos and Orlikow, doing the same given Wellington's circumstances are not unique within the city. But today we are speaking to Wellington Crescent. Unfortunately, I have avoided it since moving back after having a white-knuckle experience on my very first time using the route almost exactly where Rob Jenner was hit. And yes, the driver in Rob's case was reckless. In case you weren't aware, the vehicle that hit him was traveling at nearly 160-kilometers per hour down the crescent. But at the end of the day, Wellington Crescent encourages high speeds. It is incredibly wide and winding and hints at drivers that they can travel at highway speeds along what is first and foremost as residential as a street can be. Wellington's design is built to kill. And we need to make sure Rob's death is the last on the crescent. In an ideal world, the last death at the hands of a driver in our city, but we have already seen more deaths since then. But back to June 6th, much of that was agony, to be honest. We could see ourselves and our loved ones in Rob. When the photos of the crime scene were added to the CBC article, my stomach sank. The lead shot was Rob's bike on the boulevard. I know my way around a bicycle, so I immediately noticed that not only was the rear wheel severely mangled, but the rim had been completely obliterated. I need to emphasize here that it takes an incredible amount of force to do that. It is so clear to me, and it was so clear to me at the time, that the cyclist had been hit from behind. It tore me up. I had terrible feeling about their chances of survival. Being hit from behind by a driver is basically the worst-case scenario. I know because I speak from experience. One moment, thank you. I was headed home along Waterfront near Higgins below the Disraeli Bridge. I was so fortunate that the driver and I were slowing down as we approached a red light. Being hit from behind is scary because you have no way of anticipating it, especially on roads without dedicated separated and well-maintained infrastructure. One moment, you are rolling along, the next your body and the pavement become one. Had the driver and I not been going at similar speeds I would probably be dead today. Unlike Wendy's morning knock on her door, my partner and mom got a message saying I've been hit, but I'm okay. It took me a few minutes to type out the message through tears and although bike riding is the most joyful experience on the planet for me, I will always carry a twinge of anxiety about whether my life will be cut short, too. Now, to give you a feeling of my cycling tolerance, I not once, but twice, used the roundabout surrounding the Arc de Triomphe in Paris, France. I know Councillor Browaty is a fan of the area. They call it 'L'Étoile'. It's a roundabout made up of 12 lanes and a total of 12 entrances and exits. Pretty intense. In terms of user risk I would, frankly, compare it to Wellington Crescent where Rob was killed. My heart truly aches for Rob's family and especially Wendy. I worry everyday about who will be next if you don't do the right thing today in going forward. In the evening on June 6th, the news broke that the cyclist had died. Not a single person in our group knew Rob, but we were all grieving. There had been a life involuntarily taken too soon by entirely preventable causes, like Nardia Bedward, Tammy Bateman, Doris Porter and many others. But we spent enough time here together today, so here is my ask. As I believe in transparency, if a permanent reduction to the speed limit on Wellington Crescent is out of the question, I would ask you to consider the following: we know permanent active transport infrastructure is a solution that can be installed along Wellington, but to get to that point will take years. Even so, the prospect is really exciting. But until this permanent solution can be developed and installed, reduce Wellington Crescent to 30-kilometers an hour within 120 days. Then, once we have adequate separation between modes, revert to 50-kilometers an hour if you see the need. The interim…in the interim, reducing the speed on Wellington Crescent is an

extremely important step that must…that must happen to make Wellington Crescent safer. It's a relatively small ask, but the impact and potential to save lives cannot be over started. I understand Wellington Crescent has a rather arbitrary label that gives some city…on City Council pause. But it is just that, arbitrary. You quite literally have the power to affect change along this beautiful but perilous right-of-way lined with homes, churches and schools. These are places where elderly Winnipeggers, disabled Winnipeggers and children frequent. I'm here to urge you to make a deeply impactful and life saving decision today. Please reject the framing that the hill of violence is a misfortunate sacrifice for some greater good. Implement a 30-kilometer an hour limit along Wellington Crescent and make decisions based on decades of applicable research. We have the answers, what must come next is action. For the kids and disabled and elderly folks who don't drive, because they get…they deserve to get around safely just as much as you do. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Hillary. Please stay with us on the bench. We'll hear from the next delegation and then come back for questions. I would like to call forward Linda van de Laar. Also in opposition to same item. Welcome.

Linda van de Laar: Correct. Good morning, Mayor, councillors, thank you for having me. Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Linda. I am nurse at St. Boniface Hospital, I'm a taxpayer, I commute year-round by bicycle. And I am consciously car-ed, as in, I reluctantly own a vehicle. I am here to voice my opposition to the motion as it lays in front of you right now. The motion in front of City Council today has been severely weakened. The motion passed by the Public Works Committee on November 29th included an immediate speed reduction to 30-kilometers an hour from River Avenue where the protected bike lane starts to Academy Road west where our multi-use path starts. I am here to ask City Council to vote on the original motion as passed by the Public Works Committee. Our entire community of people who walk, drive and bike around the city are disappointed at the slow pace this city moves towards safe roads for all. It took until 2022 to fund a road safety unit. This year alone, and it's not over yet, 14 pedestrians and two cyclists were killed by drivers on our roads. Nardia Bedward, Doris Porter, Tammy Bateman; we are in a road safety crisis. And what is being done to prevent these deaths right now? This city should have acted the moment Rob Jenner was murdered, not six months later. A 19-year-old driver driving three times the speed limit killed Rob Jenner on Wellington Crescent. Why are the roads in our city designed to let drivers speed like this? We need safe speeds, enforcement and proper infrastructure to protect pedestrians and cyclists now. I really wish I could be here to show my gratitude and to celebrate, but I am not. I feel ashamed. We have to sit through four different meetings to beg for what is right. The bike mafia does have day jobs. And I am taking vacation days to be here. All available evidence out there points towards 30-kilometers an hour being the only safe speed when pedestrians and cyclists are made to share the road with drivers in 5,000-pound vehicles. The City of Winnipeg is stalling on international guidelines from the World Health Organization and the United Nations while continuing to look for Winnipeg made solutions. Winnipeg isn't special. We have heard residents sharing and reliving their traumatic experiences and in response we see a weakened motion in front of City Council today. 30-kilometers per hour on a bike route is not arbitrary. It's backed by hard evidence. Survival rate is 90 percent when pedestrian or a cyclist is hit at 30-kilometers an hour. At 40-kilometers an hour, it plummets to 60 percent. Those are people. Those are lives. There is only one reason why we are even talking about 14-kilometers an hour and it's sitting right across from me. There is no justification for it. None. It is not safer, it's not smarter, it's a half-baked compromise that costs us lives. We do not need more data. The data is here, it's on your city's website. We don't need another report to tell everyone what we already know. Why are we reasoning from the assumption that a 30-kilometer an hour speed limit will displace drivers to other roads. Why aren't we assuming that they will choose a bicycle or choose to walk? Isn't that one of your goals in your Transportation Master Plan and OurWinnipeg 2045? What is arbitrary is declaring a road a bike route and slapping of a few green signs while doing nothing to make the road safe for vulnerable road users. Arbitrary is allowing drivers to use our neighbourhoods, our streets, like racetracks. There are lots of car routes out there and I would like to be safe on our bike routes. Arbitrary is also 30-kilometer school zones while doing absolutely nothing to protect children outside of school hours. Those green bike route signs went up during the Pan-Am Games in 1999. That is 25 years ago. On my rides and walks I often feel that driver convenience is more important to the city than protecting lives. The motion in front of you only strengthens those feelings. We want…thank you.

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

Linda van de Laar: Thank you. We want connected, safe routes. We want streets where our children can walk and bike to school without fear. We want neighbourhoods where drivers don't terrorize and endanger us. We do not need more data on the impact of rerouted vehicle traffic. The goal of saver roads is more individuals using traditional means of transportation like walking and cycling. 30-kilometers per hour on the full-length of Wellington Crescent year-round is not arbitrary. It reduces confusion, it connects vital routes and it saves lives. Anything less is a failure of duty. This city has to take responsible, stop asking drivers to slow down with yard signs, make them slow down. Don't let this Council be remembered for its inertia. We will be here. We will keep fighting, but we want to fight alongside you, not against you. But if we continue to be denied and dismissed, know this, inaction on this matter makes this City Council an accomplice to the daily violence we receive on our streets. Do what is right, vote on the original Public Works motion for 30-kilometers an hour speed limit on the full-length of Wellington Crescent today while continuing to work on safe interim solutions in the future so that all vulnerable road users can be safe. We do not need more analysis paralysis.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation. We'll now take questions if there's any. Councillor Mayes. Hillary, I'll ask you to come forward, please.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you for the presentation. I don't know what the right speed limit is for that stretch of road. But I guess what I do know is, you are saying, well, don't…we are not asking for unique treatment. The trouble is, we have been told repeatedly for years there is a decision coming, there's a report coming that is city-wide, 3040. So, I am already getting e-mails from my ward saying, well, you're useless. I have written to the mayor saying how useless you are because said to us and the department said to us, we had to wait for this process. Meanwhile, my kids are in danger. So, you are actually saying, treat this uniquely and I don't blame you for doing that. If I lived there, I would do that. But I will be back in January with this, with at least three, probably more, requests. And they won't be Wellington Crescent and maybe that matters to people here. But they'll be from people who are very upset that they are not getting lower speed limits. So, here's…here is…here's a story from June of 2023. In my ward, a mangled vehicle sits wedged between two trees and partially bent around one in a Winnipeg yard after a crash critically injured a person Thursday morning. Mangled wreck burning beside his house at the corner of Victoria Crescent and Delmar. The crash…the stretch of Victoria is raised two meters from the yard. The jeep would have been traveling at an extremely high rate of speed from St. Vital Road when the driver miscalculated the curb. Police told them the vehicle went airborne off the road – airborne off the road – and traveled more than 18 meters in the air before slamming into the trees. What were they told? Wait for the process. Wait for the process. Wait for the report that covers everybody. 18 meters in the air. I don't know if they were going…and Mr. Jenner's does, obviously, retract me. I am not making any statement contrary to that. But if we are doing this for Wellington Crescent, why are we telling other people where a jeep is flying through the air, smashing…ejecting the engine, you can wait for the process. So, I don't blame you. I would be doing this if I were you. But the trouble is, well, we're telling people in my ward is, you'll wait for the process, no special treatment for you. So, if we approve this today, fine, but stand by for a flood of these. That is all I can say to people on the Public Works Committee. And if your rational is, that is not Wellington Crescent, that's fine. We clearly have dangerous other places. We have people begging to lower speed limits faulting us because their kids are at risk and we're telling them, wait for the report. So, I guess in this instance, we are not to wait for the report? I don't blame you for what you're saying, I really don't. I don't really know what the right limit is there. But I do know in my ward, when you have flying cars...

Madam Speaker: The question, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: When you have flying cars…

Councillor Rollins: City Centre moved the motion. We wrote a motion. That's a question (inaudible)

Councillor Mayes: I appreciate Councillor Rollins offer to intervene in these moments and tell us what we can ask and can't ask.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, councillor. The question, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: That's fine. That's fine. I'll withdraw the question in light of Councillor Rollins' indignation.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? They do have a response.

Councillor Mayes: And I'm not really faulting their presentation. I'm just saying, why are we treating one area (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Sure. They do have a response. Go ahead.

Linda van de Laar: Thank you. I love to see allies along City Council. It is beautiful. I would love to make an amendment to this motion in front of you. I would say every informal bike route with a nice green bike route sign to 30 today right now. I just moved wards. I'm no longer in Sherri Rollins wards, I am now commuting through St. Boniface and I believe I live in St. Vital. I commute down Des Meurons. That is a bike route. That is a very wide route. It is 50-kilometer speed limit. Every day I pass a curve in that road that has little signs to warn drivers that the curve is there. Why are drivers having the opportunity to speed down that road so fast that there needs to be a sign to warn them that there is a curve? Explain that to me. I don't get it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the response. Thank you. Any further questions? Any further questions?

Hillary Rosentreter: Madam Speaker, I would just like to invite Councillor Mayes to also bring forward his own motion if he has concerns. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you for your presentation. We will now move on to…to reports. Mr. Mayor, the report on the Executive Policy Committee dated October 16th.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 16, 2024

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, Madam Speaker. October 16th, I would like to introduce this report and, actually, move layover until the January Council meeting on this item, which is Item 6 of the report that moves adoption. I heard that the…Item 6 of the report, okay. As per…I spoke with the area councillor, Councillor Mayes, on this and I think he concurs, January…to deal with this in January will be better.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll move layover, as on the floor. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Mr. Mayor, the report dated December 4th.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 4, 2024

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 9, 11 to 14. Pulling 10 because 10 has an amending motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. 12 has been pulled. Proposed Opening and Rededication of the Public Walk Plan between Strongberg Drive and De Vries. That's been pulled. Anything else? I'll call the question. Call the question on Item 1 through 9 and 11, 13 and 14. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I know conversations usually happen around our chamber here, but they seem to be a little too loud for me, Madam Speaker. So, if you could…

Madam Speaker: I agree, it is difficult to hear. So, let's proceed with the agenda and respect when other members of Council have the floor. Madam Clerk.

Item 10 – Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF) – 2025 Proposed Initiatives

Madam Speaker: Thank you. There are two amending motions to go with this item. The Mayor will introduce the item. There's amending Motion 1: moved by the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Rollins. And then, amending Motion 2: moved by Councillor Mayes and seconded by Councillor Orlikow. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Am I speaking to the amending motion as well?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Mayor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Rollins,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has been promoting social and economic development by enabling affordable housing through a variety of motions, revising the zoning by-law in a phased approach to streamline projects, reduce red tape and in partnership with Indigenous, Federal and Provincial Governments has exceeded targets for new housing units in 2024;

AND WHEREAS the Federal Government's National Housing Strategy is one of the most impactful partnerships helping Winnipeg to achieve targets with affordable housing partners faster with contribution agreements such as the Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF) Agreement and related initiatives and incentives;

AND WHEREAS in July 2023 City Council approved the establishment of a Program to Support Infrastructure and Servicing Upgrades ("the infrastructure program") to support new housing development as one of eight initiatives to be funded under the HAF;

AND WHEREAS the City's HAF contribution agreement with the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) requires the infrastructure program to be approved by December 2024 and complete its launch by April 2025;

AND WHEREAS the Public Service has requested an extension from CMHC to December 2025 to design and implement the infrastructure program under the delegated authority granted to the Chief Administrative Officer by Council in July 2023 to negotiate and approve the terms of the HAF contribution agreement between the City and CMHC;

AND WHEREAS the Public Service's rationale to defer the infrastructure program to December 2025 was to allow the City to use its HAF funding in 2024 and 2025 to fund existing HAF initiatives to support projects that are development ready, and can deliver building permits faster than an infrastructure program can;

AND WHEREAS CMHC has recently advised the Public Service that they are supportive of the City approving the principles of an infrastructure program in December 2024, publicly launching this program in April 2025, with application intake and adjudication to be completed by December 2025 and notice of funding approval to successful applicants under this program by January 2026, once the City receives its 2026 HAF allocation from CMHC;
AND WHEREAS based on CMHC's latest communication to the Public Service, approving the principles of an infrastructure program in December 2024 , with a supporting by-law for this program to be considered by Council before launching this program in April 2025 satisfies the intent of the Council approved infrastructure milestone under the HAF Agreement.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 10 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated December 4, 2024, be amended by adding the following new recommendations and renumbering the remaining accordingly:

"11. That the principles of a Program to Support Infrastructure and Servicing Upgrades to support new housing development, as described in Attachment A to this motion and called the Multi-Family Sustainable Housing Infrastructure Program (MSHIP), be approved.

12. That the Public Service be directed to report back to Council with additional details on the Multi-Family Sustainable Housing Infrastructure Program (MSHIP) for Council approval and enactment of the program by-law in January 2025."

Mayor Gillingham: Okay, so I will speak to the item. I want to thank the Public Service for their report here. This is, obviously, related to the Housing Accelerator Fund. 122 million dollars from the Federal Government to be coming to the City of Winnipeg in four tranches of funding. The first tranche has gone out the door…going out the door very…successfully several applicants were successful in applying for funding. And we have incentivized some building which quite a few projects that we believe should turn shovels in 2025. The second tranche of funding, the Public Service, I'm highlighting, is recommending that because there were so many good applications for the first tranche, and the first tranche was over-subscribed significantly. But there are projects there that in those applications that didn't get funding in the first tranche, but really, are shovel ready and the staff…the Housing Accelerator Fund staff would really recommend that we look to that stack, as it were, of good applicants to identify opportunities to provide grants to another round of funding. We go clarity from the discussion with both Minister Fraser's office and CMHC. Got clarity around the need for us to at least initiate the infrastructure program, the Multi-Family Sustainable Housing Infrastructure Program. We need to at least initiate this to comply with the terms of the housing accelerator fund. We want to make sure that we are in compliance. We need to be in compliance with both our reporting and with the staging and timing of the dates, meeting the dates, meeting the targets that are within that fund…within the agreement that we have, you know, entered into with the Federal Government. What this amending motion does is make sure that we can both really follow-through on the recommendations of Public Service so that the second tranche of funds could be used for additional projects and to approve additional projects providing grants to additional projects, including what is recommended if Council agrees two significant projects: one, funding for rail side and second, funding for the Southern Chiefs Organization transformation of The Bay, the Wehwehneh project, very important project for the downtown. We also, though, and that's what the amending motion is about, we also need to initiate the infrastructure program with the details and the by-law coming back to Council early in the new year. But this amendment would make sure that we are in compliance with both the funding…the Housing Accelerator Fund Agreement. It satisfies CMHC in dialogue with Minister Frasier's office. It works for them, as well. So, these amendments really will get us…keep us on track with what we need to do as far as this fund. So, I'm certainly, obviously, supporting the main clause and the amending motion here. And I will wait to hear from Councillor Mayes and Orlikow. I think on the surface I understand what I see before me, I think. I'm just going to check, I think there may be some timing issues related to this, but I will wait to hear from my colleagues and then maybe speak to it at the end. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Mayes, your in…your opportunity to speak to the amending motion and the main item.

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

WHEREAS the 4-unit (4-plex) section of the HAF commitment 1.5, 1.6 has a deadline of June 12, 2025;

AND WHEREAS "council approved" by June 12, 2025 does not require by-law approved as shown by the by-law approval scheduled for January 2025 for infrastructure;

AND WHEREAS the City housing staff explicitly state in their HAF report approved by the Executive Policy Committee (EPC) that future years of HAF funding are uncertain after 2025;

AND WHEREAS the HAF FAQ (Nov, 2023) identifies the 4-unit requirement as a "federal condition";

AND WHEREAS the 4-units count as zero units towards the city "HAF incentivized target";

AND WHEREAS there is no requirement for the 4-units to contain any affordable housing;

AND WHEREAS there is no requirement that the 4-units be located in lower-income areas;

AND WHEREAS there is no incremental Federal funding payable to the City for any 4-unit housing;

AND WHEREAS section 12.3 of the the HAF agreement stipulates that nothing fetters Council discretion;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED Item 10 of the report from Executive Policy Committee dated December 4, 2024 be amended by adding the following new recommendation and renumbering the remaining accordingly:

"11. That the Public Service be directed to delay the public hearing on 4-units from March 2025 to June 2025 in order to obtain further clarity about the continued existence of the Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF) program."

Councillor Mayes: And I will be able to close on the amending motion, presumably, in due course?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Thank you to the Mayor for his comments. I am in favour of...I mean, the Mayor's amending motion largely changes the recommendations of the report. That said, I am in favour of the amending motion put forward by the Mayor. I want to commend Moira Geer who's wrapping up her career here. And Richard Mahé, as well, from the HAF office. The report that's in front of you, that's on the screen, makes, frankly, a very obvious and legally correct statement that we cannot assume we will get the money from the HAF in 2026 and 2027. That's actually in the HAF agreement, as they say. Look at Article 12.3, I believe it is, in the HAF agreement. So, I liked the concept of let's try and get the second tranche of money. Which, as they say – which as they say – is coming in the first quarter of 2025. Let's get that and put it toward the housing units rather than putting it toward infrastructure. I agree with that. So, I will be supporting the Mayor's motion. And the amending motion that I am putting forward with Councillor Orlikow, I would hope people listen to this. Somebody said once, aw, nobody listens. And then years after on Council, Morantz said to me, I remember you saying, so people do listen here. So, the amending motion moves to have a hearing on the four-unit, four-plex item. I'm hearing that currently is scheduled for March. We don't have dates yet. That hearing would be in June rather than in March. First question, does that breach the HAF agreement? No, it does not. We know the HAF agreement says we need to have Council approval by June 12th, 2025. So, we are not in breach of the agreement. There is no excuse for the Federal Government to withhold funding under the second tranche. We are completely in compliance if we move that hearing. Secondly, we've already separated out the hearings. We did malls and corridors first and we're doing this second. That isn't what was in Council's original motion back in November of 2023. But that is what we have chosen to do. If we move the hearing to June, there are a number of advantages. Number one, much longer, better public consultation process over a plan that really will rezone the entire city. We should have a number of public sessions on this. Give people a chance to get the information. All of us have been briefed, confidentially, on what the public administration is proposing. We're not at liberty…we can't say that. I am not opposed to all of it, I'm not in favour of all of it. I continue to have an open mind. I continue to have an open mind (inaudible) I actually put out a discussion paper on this and there were some elements of that which have been incorporated, which I appreciate. That said, we should have ample opportunity for the public to take place…take part in this process. Saying we'll consult in January at the same time we are consulting on the budget and then we'll have our hearing in March, I don't think gives an adequate opportunity for what is a major policy change. Is…it is not a change that the Mayor ran on, unlike malls and corridors. Nobody ran on this. This was a federal condition. It is…if you look at the HAF FAQ page, it's described that way by our own. So, okay, what would that mean if

we delay the hearing until June, some have said late May, I think that might work, as well. Oh, we'll miss the deadline. No, we won't. It is June of 2025 is when we have to have the vote. Oh, we won't get the by-laws done. Well, look at the Mayor's proposal today on infrastructure. We won't have the by-laws done by the deadline December 15th, 2024. We won't. We won't. The by-laws are coming a month later. So, the by-laws can come after Council approval. In fact, my appreciation to the e-mail from Mr. Armbruster earlier this week that said, well, the Federal Government has even said, if somebody takes this matter, takes the by-laws to the Municipal Board, you don't need to change the agreement. So, the by-laws can come later. We know that, thank you to Mr. Armbruster for clarifying that. Thank you to the Mayor for clarifying that. We know the by-laws can come later, so let's have the hearing in June. What's another advantage? Well, frankly, we keep saying to people, oh, we are doing this because it's…we won't get the money. It's a federal inquisition. It's a federal requirement. And then people say, but what if the government changes? What if there's an election? Fair question. The report envisages that. What you have in front of you says, we acknowledge that the funding may not be coming after 2025. To the credit of Dryburgh, Mahé, Geer, they're being open. In fact, the agreement itself says it is subject to parliamentary approval. Look at section 12 of the HAF agreement. So, let us have this debate. And we will have the debate. And I have an open mind about the debate. Let us have this debate in a real-world context. If the government has changed hands, then perhaps the new government will have very different priorities and rules and the funding will not be there. But to have a debate in March saying we have to do this in order to get the money, but we are not sure if we're going to get the money, introduces an element, frankly, of unreality to the public hearing and I would suggest makes the whole public hearing possibly challengeable. So, let's wait till June. You're going to hear people say a number of things. You're going to hear people say, well, I guess you are not in favour of housing. Let's be clear. What we are debating under the Mayor's motion delays the infrastructure program. That's to incentivize 698 units of affordable housing – of housing – some of which it will be affordable. 698 being delayed. What is the target under the four-plex? It's zero. We had said, I'm missing middle, and the staff itself says in the FAQ, missing middle is only 5 percent of our total target. So, this is a very small percent of the target, this missing middle. In fact, single family homes are much bigger. We're incentivizing single family homes. It seems odd, doesn't it? So, the missing middle part is very small. We had said in our original draft, 288 units. We got about 60 percent of the funding. So, times point six, we're saying 174 units of missing middle. We can do that in a number of different ways. We didn't change the target when the imposed four-plex was brought in by the Federal Government. We didn't change the target, it's still 174. We were actually told by staff 134. To my credit, I pointed out that is a typo, it should be higher. The target's actually 174. So, none of that hinges on the four-plexes. We didn't change the target after we got this requirement for four-plexes. So, I'm not delaying anything. None of the four-plexes have to be affordable. None of the four-plexes require the infrastructure money. None of the four-plexes have to be downtown. They could all be in my ward. They could all be in Councillor Orlikow's ward. They could all be in Councillor Chambers' ward. We don't know, but we do know none of this addresses the concern that Councillor Santos raised, Councillor Gilroy raised, Councillor Eadie raised in the debate about malls and corridors. Why are we putting all this money out in the suburban shopping centre when my ward could desperately use the funding? Let's do something about that in the interim. Let's do what we said in our original plan that talked about local area plans. We can do that in the next few months and I would…I would hope for support from my colleagues here who've expressed this concern. I am trying to address it. What did we say in our local area plan proposal? Potential amendments to facilitate additional residential development include West Alexander-Centennial, Corydon-Osborne, North Henderson. West Alexander-Centennial. So, here we are, we had a plan to try and do some units in these areas where the councillors are saying, can we please do some units. The four-plex debate doesn't do any of that. So, why don't we have that in June when we'll have a better idea if the money is coming at all. Don't tell me, oh, that means we won't get paid. The second tranche of money is due in first quarter 2025. That is what this report says. We are completely in compliance with the agreement except where we've requested changes and they've been granted. And again, thanks to Mr. Armbruster who has indicated its initiative number three, milestone four, we're not going to get there in time. We asked for an extension, they gave us an extension. That is bulletproof. So, I'm not even asking for an extension. I'm saying, let's just live up to what we said, June 12th of 2025. Oh, you say, well, that…I guess you are not in favour of more housing? No, I am quite happy. I…we're delaying 698 on infrastructure. This is delaying zero. Also, if you're going to lecture me about housing, we did just vote unanimously not to proceed at Lemay Forrest 800 units the staff recommended. So, apparently the crisis is not quite so bad on some areas. So, let's just keep that in mild. So, we can delay this debate. We can delay it until June, maybe May as some have said. Okay, let's delay the debate until we have a better idea where things stand with the Federal Government. Doesn't breach the agreement, doesn't require an amendment to the agreement. None of that is required. Let's have a respectful public consultation process and let's have a debate where we know if there is a gun to our head or not, quite frankly. Because they…and people may want to do this even if there isn't money coming. Fine, but let's not have a debate where we say, oh, there's…you know, oh, there…this is a…we have to do this to get the money. The program has had some benefits, certainly. We've gotten money out the door. Mr. Mahe's done a terrific job, I think, getting money out the door to these different projects. None of that would be delayed by what I am proposing with Councillor Orlikow. None of it. The social housing money would still continue to flow. I'll need a brief extension, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: The timing saying March is not in our original motion that we approved. Well, 13 of…votes approved it in November of 2023. The timing saying March is not in the HAF agreement at any place. The timing saying March is not in the minister's letter. None of that is…that detail is in there. What is in the detail is…or what is in the agreement is article 12.3. 12.2 is where they say, as is pointed out in the report, it changes year to year. Parliament doesn't approve the money, we don't have the money. Good risk mitigation strategy by our staff. I commend the report. I commend that realism. Here is what 12.3 in the agreement says, nothing in this agreement will fetter the discretion of the recipients elected council as to future decisions by the elected council. Nothing will fetter our discretion. We get to decide when we debate stuff. And I'm saying, let's use our…let's have that debate in a much more realistic context than claiming there's a gun to our head. Let's have it later on. We'll see what happens with the federal situation. Nothing in this agreement will fetter the discretion of the recipients elected council as to future decisions. So, I'm not saying we're saying no, I'm saying let's just have the debate later. A better more well-informed debate. I'm not faulting the staff for some of what they are recommending. I agree with some of it. I will have questions about some of it. But let's have an open, honest, transparent debate with lots of public input. I mean, you're going to have about 200 plus people coming down here to speak. It will take a week probably. And you're going to say to each and every one of those people if we have the hearing in March, we have to do this to get the money, but we're not sure if we are going to get the money. Well, I think that is not really a public consultation. That's not really a legitimate public hearing, in fact. Let's wait until June. We can. There's nothing that breaches the agreement by waiting till June. So, that is the motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Next is Councillor Rollins. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, first of all, I want to revisit some of the thanks, Madam Speaker, to this Council. As your Chair of Property and Development, your chair of housing, this has been...just one moment please. Technical difficulties.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, you are speaking to the item before us? Could you return to your seat so we can hear you in the microphone, please. Councillor Rollins? Councillor Rollins? Okay. Councillor Schreyer.

Mayor Gillingham: Do we need to take a recess? I am not sure what's happening.

Madam Speaker: No, Councillor Rollins is giving up her speaking time at the moment. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I've got to say, that was a good speech by Councillor Brian Mayes. I learned something and I am pretty sure we all did. Yet again, in terms what is one of…what is one of Councillor Mayes' specialties? Giving us a good chronology of events and a chronological relationship between and among actions. I don't know, I am sure there is a better way of explaining it, but I have been watching this for 10 years and he did it again. And I sure learned something and I really appreciate it. It's something that we needed to hear like that. And it gives me confidence. He just gave me confidence in Councillor Mayes' and Orlikow's motion. And on that basis, I've got to say, therefore, I am grateful to the Mayor, to our CAO, Mr. Armbruster, and to Richard Mahé and all those involved in explaining by word, and by deed, by action, how it is that Councillor Mayes is right. That it doesn't need to be this way as some have made their concerns. That certain things have to follow in a certain way. And on that basis, we are not reaching our commitments and I thank Councillor Mayes very much for explaining that. Because if we didn't know that, we could think that we are breaching our agreements. I don't…I mean, I'm…hey, we're open-minded. You never know. We all know here what's our job, you know, listen to different sides of this. So, maybe if there is someone there…here…now can make a speech and explain how Councillor Mayes is wrong, I will be impressed. And on that basis, well, you know, I just want to thank all those involved that Brian Mayes cites in bringing around the, sort of the proof of precedent and therefore, lack of need of concern for breaching our commitments. I have confidence in Councillor Mayes' explanation. Well researched, not surprising. And some of these things he just seems to just know cause and effect over periods of months and years. And I look forward to anyone that wishes to contest his logic and reasoning. And I thank him for his contribution on this issue because it's really important. I can't believe how short my speech is.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to express my support for the Mayes' amendment. You know, this whole thing has been so rushed. And I think things get missed sometimes. I know our Public Service works diligently. We have consultant working on all this stuff. There is all of this activity. But you know, it's pretty complex moving ahead with this in terms of like where and how it's…the four-by-four or whatever, how it's all going to work. There are special areas I think that need a little more focus and further seeking and development. And I think that, you know, contrary to our motion…His Worship's motion about the infrastructure. So, it's asking us, we're going to…this is the time we are debating it. And then it calls that there will be a by-law that comes back with rules of how things will work, Madam Speaker. And so, in there, when it says by-laws come back, Madam Speaker, as you know, by-laws voted on are not debatable. There was actually some confusion about our malls and corridors. Somebody from OurWinnipeg was asking, you know, for us to

amend the by-laws, but it's not debatable. It's either you vote for it or against it. So, what we are being asked in the Mayor's is…and you know, I do trust, Madam Speaker, I do trust the administration. I don't know where the influences are or how these infrastructure dollars will be spent. But Madam Speaker, you know, I just wanted to clarify that. But the more detail and the more the Public Service consults, the more they'll find concerns in regards to the four-by-four stuff. And I think that extending the time will allow for maybe even a better streamlined debate and discussions as the hearing moves forward. So, I see no reason why not to delay it to June of 2025, Madam Speaker. So, I am just going to really quickly conclude that, yes, voting for Councillor Mayes' amendment. And I was just merely pointing out in His Worship's motion that, yeah, we will get to see the details after. But when we vote on it, it will only be in a by-law. We won't be able to discuss or debate around our chamber here. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, I will be voting for both. Yeah, thanks.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Look, really good discussion. Like, I apologize for leaving the chamber unexpectedly. This Council has worked really hard on zoning by-laws. This Council is going to be going into January consulting on budget. There are many councillors that will therefore be doing double duty in terms of leaning in. As we know, Madam Speaker, Councillor Mayes has in his ward to get ahead of Property and Development Zoning By-law changes that could impact his ward. And perhaps that was attended just like my consultations have by all…you know, all areas of the city, you know, when we do as councillors open up our public consultations and our town halls to, you know, really anyone who's available to come. So, I do really…I do really see merit in considering not moving it to June, Madam Speaker, but you know, getting it on the other side of budget, right? So, I was looking and saying…thinking, you know…you know, March, April, that window, Madam Speaker. But we have infrastructure needs in this city. And we have a Federal Government who is listening to municipalities and what they need in terms of housing development. And there is no question that we need infrastructure, Madam Speaker. We need pipes. We need a North End treatment plant, Madam Speaker. And we need more to make sure that we have the capacity to continue to build. Whether it is the, you know, the…our work on combined sewer, whether it is our work on riverbank stabilization, something that I worked on with Budget Working Group not too long ago. There is need to look at infrastructure and be as nimble as possible. So, while I appreciate the motion from Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Mayes, in particular, because I would like an opportunity to get outside of budget timing and move into consultations. Because I know that this Council and the two committees that have been to…you know, the councillors have been part of Property and Development have worked really hard to do both, to do all things. So, that, you know, for those reasons, I understand the motion. I'd prefer, of course, that it, you know, was earlier. The motion to ensure that we are doing an infrastructure program. There is many voices on this, Madam Speaker, within HAF. And I want to thank the Housing Accelerator Fund team, and in particular, our Deputy Mayor, Moira Geer. They have been working full out to position the City for strength and to…and have exceeded our targets that we set out at the beginning of the year. That's really exciting, Madam Speaker. And as we're all needing a break and we're feeling rather tired, I think it's really important to turn to the department and have a really grateful heart, turn to the CAO's Office where the Housing Accelerator Fund team Winnipeg is housed and really thank them for their work on the Canada Housing Infrastructure Fund. And you know, their work on the Canada Housing Accelerator Fund, and their work here. I would characterize the report that came to EPC as a bit of an inside voice, Madam Speaker. And so, I know that there are election cycles, but what I want to focus on is the strength and the power of what we can build together with the federal and the provincial government when it comes to housing. The Rapid Housing Initiative, shoulder-to-shoulder with Indigenous governments, with the provincial government, we drew down that funding and we produced results that are housing people. And Madam Speaker, we spent a lot of time on rent geared to income and we spent a lot of time on the affordability question, but I think it's really important to note that many of the units are social housing. They are for folks that are sometimes have a...you know, that they have their rent paid for themselves. They have wraparound supports. And that is really critical to understand. The same thing for the Housing Accelerator Fund. Sometimes we are choosing projects that are supportive housing, Madam Speaker, and that is really important to address when we have a report like we do on chronic housing need. I am very interested in this amendment because as a councillor in the downtown, as a councillor who meets with developers from across the city, they don't have the infrastructure they need to put the buildings and in particular, the multi-family buildings they need. I am very also interested in the sustainability aspects, Madam Speaker. I think it is really critical and other cities do, too, that our housing stock is not only affordable, but it is also affordable in the long-term. And we know renters in particular are more subject to the vulnerabilities of the increased heating costs and more if the buildings aren't near net zero to net zero. And so, that makes this motion exciting for me, too, Madam Speaker. We are told that we need to do more. That we need to harmonize with the council's environment investment roadmap and this does, Madam Speaker. So, for those reasons, while I am in support of the main motion, I'm supportive of the, obviously, the amending motion co-signed with the Mayor. I…you know, I do think there is some things to merit of getting us outside of budget and on the other side before engaging in consultation. But Madam Speaker, time is of the essence. And the Canada Housing Infrastructure Fund, the Canada Accelerator Fund is about acceleration, it's about doing things rapidly. And for those reasons, I'm not supportive of the motion to delay it further.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I wan to rise. I won't be supporting Councillor Mayes and Councillor Orlikow's motion. You know, I inherited the development of Waverley West and I mean, it's going great guns, right. It's going great guns. We've heard a lot about expanding the city and growing the city. We've heard about the positives and the negatives about new development on the outskirts. What these two, three and four-plexes will do is allow gentle density in our city. We are one of the leaser…lesser dense cities across Canada. And what this will do is it will allow more housing in areas that have existing capacity, that have existing services, that have services that we don't have to add on and extend on the outskirts of the city. So, I think that it's important that we move forward on this. I think that it's important that we have our open house, our session in January, and proceed with it. We all know that the sort of elephant in the room is the possibility of a government changing and that we see the statistics, we see the polling of what may or may not happen. What probably will happen when the government changes. And we have heard statements from the opposition of what will happen if they come to power related to the housing…to the HAF program. Sometimes we need exterior forces to help us make decisions. And I think that we really need to move towards gentle density in our city. And that's…that needs to happen. I really believe that. As someone who has taken a lot of heat about Waverley West and the expansion and the growth on the outskirts of city, and seeing the density there and seeing and how great it is and how we are able to deliver services, but at a cost. We've got opportunities in the city right now to add this gentle density and I think we need to move on it. I think we all know that if the government changes that the HAF program we are told will be no longer in existence. So, I think it's important that we move on it. I won't be supporting Councillor Mayes' and Orlikow's motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I'll be quite quick. First of all, I want to thank Councillor Mayes. I think a lot of the information today was coming back on the matter today. Councillor Mayes would never have know that stuff, no one would have, unless we actually get the actual application. So, now, Councillor Mayes had the application and with his Hilroy binders has gone through it and looked at facts. Okay, so I think this is another example why councillors need to able to see these applications before they go out. So, again, I thank Councillor Mayes pick that ball up and running with it. I do support Councillor Mayes' motion. Why? Because as Councillor Lukes said, the debate is about HAF is confusing things a lot between the debate about having infill, regardless. And including Councillor Lukes' ward. They should be in there. There's some very big houses that are sitting there on single lots. There is opportunity there, I see everywhere. I drive through there to try…because I have to, getting up north…south, I mean. So, again, that's another great opportunity, I believe. But again, we have to have that debate. Now, it's pretty hard to have that debate, as I've mentioned a number of times, when we have these other motions or other funding buckets, baskets, with mandates in them as well for housing. We've got the Canadian Building Fund that's going to require us to do four-plexes throughout city. We have the Canadian…the transit fund that says no parking minimums allowed. Well, you know what, until we actually get the…if we actually applied and get that, we should be able to provide the people with a full sense of what they are getting into. We know, for example, we go with the fours and fours. I'm not going to mention the other possible units that will be included because we are not allowed to. But again, it's a…the idea there is there will be parking. Well, if the Winnipeg Transit fund goes forward, we're going to just (inaudible), in three months later say, oh, actually, you know what? We have to now take the parking away. I guarantee you in a public hearing that would be a pretty big issue for a lot of people to figure out that they don't have any parking minimums required. I think that'd be…and how the Public Service works that out, I don't know. But again, I think it has to be altogether. That is very important. Councillor Mayes has also pointed out we are not going to be behind the…we're not going to be too late. If we want to have the debate about where infill should go city-wide, I don't disagree. I do disagree with as-of-right housing. And maybe now we can just focus on that aspect rather than these federal mandates that are coming down on us, including the as-of-right. Which again, I am surprised about when I read the application in the mature neighbourhood file. The department actually indicated they will be pursuing as-of-right on their own without Council policy. That's why I was shocked when I read that because you know what? Maybe we…we as Council will agree to that, but again, we never had that administrative decide to make a policy statement that said, we will be focusing on as-of-right housing in mature neighbourhoods, again, without Council direction at all. Very troubling. Again, that is why we need to see these reports. The idea about changing the area plans; well, again, that I noticed when I read the application. That we're going to do 20, 30 of these things. I see it there. That's why I was quite confused in the corridors that we just did little tweaks. I thought that would be a bigger tweak. Well, it wasn't. So, maybe that is coming down the pipe. And like we say, we can have the chance to see what that means in the context. It would be pretty loathsome to go through this and say, okay, everybody…Point Douglas or whoever you are, area plans, you'll be all okay because we're not focusing on today. We're going to…oh, but then, four months later, well, we've modified all the area plans now, so you are actually back in after the public hearing has been closed. So, I do believe we are going too fast. I know some people don't think we are. Some people don't think we should actually consult with the neighbourhood either. I know that. We all have difference of opinions. I do. I strongly feel that part of the democratic right of individuals is to be able to have their voice heard. I may not like their voices, I may like their voices, I may be indifferent to their voices, but they have the right to do so. So, again, to do so, they need the whole breadth of information so they can make those proper decisions when they come forward. Some people are going to hate it period. Some people, like the homebuilders and other groups, are going to love it, period. As long as it gets what they want, but there is a good group in the middle that just aren't too sure. They like to have the information. We would like to have the information better. Right now, I have seen what they are saying,

how they're going to do the public hearings for the next round. Ridiculous. Might as well just take ad in the paper. Ridiculous. I hope that will change by the time we go forward, but at this point, I don't see the focus on, actually, the residents of Winnipeg. I see the focus on the federal government mandate. I see the focus on ideology. I see the focus on many things, but I don't see the focus for the residents that are existing here in Winnipeg. So, again, not saying I don't like it. And I would like to have this HAF thing over with. I would. Remember we went for a nine…192 million dollars, now we're maybe down to 60? 60 million dollars. From 192 million dollar ask, we're down to 60. But again, we are saying we have to do all of this because of the Housing Accelerator Fund. We have to, have to, have to. Well, no, we don't. We want to do that, I agree. That's a separate process. But don't hang this HAF thing over our head if we don't do this, we're not going to make money, we could make the money, we don't know. Let's have the…let's separate these two debates out if we can. So, let's pause, like Councillor Mayes is saying. Let's see what happens. The Federal Government, who knows if the government's going to change. You know, my bet is probably. But again, who knows? Maybe it won't happen. Maybe the incoming government won't change their mind and they'll say, you know what, I think…even though it's really loud public announcements by one party about the…to get rid of it. But we don't know, and as this report says. So, I am going to be supporting Councillor Mayes. I also really appreciate the amending motion from the Mayor. I think, again, if that money is in jeopardy, which we have said it is, let's get those units built. Let's get those grants out the door. So, that is fabulous. I think I can definitely support that. I would like to see…still haven't seen it to this day, a budget about how much we're going to be putting into infrastructure and how much…even the old report that we got, all the numbers are still mixed up because they based it on the old numbers. Having seen that, having seen how many we're doing in each unit, what areas of town, again, that is another longer discussion I've been having for months. But at this point, I believe this is warranted because it won't have an impact. We can still have a debate, but we can have a proper debate. So, let's hold. Let's follow Councillor Mayes'. Let's pass the Mayor's amending motion today so we can make sure that at least happens. But again, so, I am supporting the amending…the Mayor's amending motion and I'm also supporting Councillor Mayes' amending motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Mayes to close and then the Mayor.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you to Councillor Orlikow. I should have thanked earlier for seconding the motion. I should also thank Hazel Boris, James Veitch, Rob Kostiuk, others, who have talked to me about…about the four-unit four-plexes over time. A number of things, the arguments made by Councillor Lukes and Councillor Rollins actually support a delay in this motion to...and I mean, Councillor Rollins is saying, look, I wouldn't mind pushing this a bit later past the budget. Well, March is what we were already saying. We were going to do the consultation in January when we were consulting on the budget. So, no, I think it makes sense to wait till June. Time is of the essence, I'm told, as we vote to delay the 698 units that would be incentivized by the infrastructure vote. We are voting and I will be supporting the Mayor's motion. It delays implementing the infrastructure plan, it does, inarguable, to the next year. So, if time is of the essence then, well, why are we delaying 698 units, but we're saying we have to get going on this other thing that literally incentivizes no units toward our target? Councillor Lukes' argument is a terrific argument of why we should wait because she is talking about things aren't four-plexes and four-stories. She's talking about other issues. We could have that debate separately, but…we could, but we should have it separately and not under the guise of, well, we have to do this to get the money. If you are going to increase density by 400 percent in my ward, please do not describe that as gentle densification. But surely, I'm just gently moving the deadline. I'm just gently moving it a few months. My gentle motion, my gentle amendment here and gently move the vote from March to June, only a few months. So, I think if we're going to toss around the word 'gentle' to try and condition or explain our actions, I'll do so as well. It's only a three month thing. We are not breaching the agreement. We are not breaching any requirements from our motion that we passed in November of '23. We are not breaching the minister's letter. In no way does this breach any legal requirement. It will, however, give us a chance to a) have much better public consultation. B) we'll have a better idea if indeed there is a spring election or if we're in the middle of an election campaign, we will know the context in which we are having a public hearing. The details, we will all go in with an open mind. I continue to have an open mind. I have put forward ideas of what I would want to see. Again, the debate is supposed to be about four-plexes and four-stories, not duplexes, triplexes. So, let's be clear on that. That is what the debate is supposed to be about. That is what the federal condition was and it was a federal condition. I don't know. The idea that, well, we have to do this because we need money for the North End plant, we need transit money and we need other money. None of that is before us. None of that has been presented to us. No one has ever come forward with a document and said, this is the amount you're going to get on transit, but you have to do X. This is the money you're going to get on that North End plant, but you have to do zoning amendments. It seems completely disconnected to me. So, none of that is before us. So, all we have is, let's have a proper public consultation and a proper debate about this. It will affect every ward, it will not affect every ward equally. So, let's…I would like to spend the time…I would like time of the essence to apply to the concerns raised by Councillor Santos, Councillor Eadie and Councillor Gilroy. Can we not do something in our areas? I would be delighted to work on the local area plans to help incentivize that. Let's do that in March. It talks about that in our proposal. West Alexander-Centennial has talked about…let's emphasize that, I would argue, to Councillor Santos and Eadie and to Gilroy. So, what are we left with at the end of the day? We're left with a chance to have this debate in a more realistic context with much better public consultation about a plan that will rezone the entire city. We are not in breach. We do not jeopardize the second tranche of funding, which is tabled. As our City staff

said, the second tranche is payable, which has been delayed, which is an amendment to the agreement, incidentally. The second tranche of money, 30 million dollars, coming in first quarter 2025. We're not in breach. We're not saying no. We're just saying, as we have the discretion to do, we're going to have this debate a little later. We're going to gently move the deadline to June. We're going to have the…we'll make a decision then. And then, we will actually have a realistic context for what the conditions, what pressures we face. So, I would encourage everyone to vote for this today. I would hope…I know there are concerns throughout the city. Councillor Browaty, Councillor Duncan, others have talked about that. I have to say, I think the arguments made by Councillor Rollins and Councillor Lukes actually point to having this at a later date. So, if you're convinced time is of the essence and this delays housing, then why are you voting for a motion that's going to delay 698 units under the Infrastructure Plan? If you were concerned that this is anti-housing, remember, none of these units have to be affordable. None of them have to go downtown. That is bulletproof. That is absolutely clear. If you are concerned about housing, why did we unanimously vote against 800 units at Lemay Forrest? Because we can make intelligent decisions is the answer. We can discriminate. We don't have to say, density of where all the time, and then just call it density…gentle densification. We can make more intelligent decisions if we wait till June and we hear from the public. The public is not red tape. They are the people who elect us. Let's have an honest, more open, better informed debate in June. It will not breach anything under this agreement. Remember what the agreement says. Nothing in this agreement will fetter the discretion of the elected council as to future decisions by the elected council. So, let's have this debate. We'll have an open mind about it. Let's have it in June, though, instead of March. We're not breaching anything. We'll get outside the budget, as Councillor Rollins has suggested. We can go forward in June. We'll see who is in power. Last comment, I wish to thank the Federal Government for the money we have received to date. It is welcome. It will be welcome when we get that second tranche in first quarter of 2025. These are good things to get the money toward the social and affordable housing. None of this affects that. None of this housing on the four-plexes is affordable housing. It doesn't have to be. None of its in any areas of concern that we've talked about here. None of it's in anybody's election platform who sits around this table. So, we appreciate the Federal Government's funding. As the report says, things might change. So, let's have a debate in June and we'll have a better informed debate and, frankly, it will be a better democratic exercise when we have the public to take part. Thank you.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A lot of discussions today. The big question is to delay the fourth and fours hearing until June. Would it put us in contravention of the agreement? And I think that's a key question that we need to understand. And so, I'm wondering if our CAO may have some information. If we could we call the CAO to the podium, I would like to do that, please, to ask a couple questions related to the timing. Is it a matter that we need to have the hearing by June or do we need the by-laws adopted by June? Because if we need the by-laws adopted by June, you all…you know, that…then June is certainly out of the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I will have the CAO come forward. Good morning. Your question, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Through you, Madam Speaker, thank you to the CAO for coming forward. Just wondering if the CAO, interim CAO, Mr. Armbruster, could shed a little bit of light on this. He's no doubt been hearing the debate.

Madam Speaker: So question of clarification is?

Mayor Gillingham: The question of clarification is whether or not we need by-laws adopted by June or any other…any other aspects of this debate that he could shed light on would be helpful and informative. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Sherwood Armbruster: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you to the Mayor, members of Council, good morning. And I also would like to echo thanks, appreciation to the HAF team, Deputy CAO, Moira Geer, Richard Mahé and Legal Services for their…for their assistance in providing Council with the information that is before you today. And the answer to the question, I did circulate a memo a few moments ago. I have been listening to discussions and am in communication with Legal Services and the HAF team. And the reading of the agreement is that the by-laws do need to be passed by June 12th, 2025, of this year related to those specific sections of the agreement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further question, Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Gillingham: Second round.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes. We will see. This is not regular question period. Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: The by-laws for the infrastructure item under the HAF agreement where we are clearly changing provisions under the agreement. Your e-mail earlier this week said by-laws could be approved in January. So, what you are saying is, the by-laws need to be approved in January, though the deadline for Council approval of the infrastructure is December, but the by-laws can come in January. Also said, if the by-laws are challenged on first reading from the Municipal Board for any of these provisions, that's also okay. That's not in breach of the agreement. So, I'm mystified as to how suddenly it is okay for the infrastructure to have the by-laws a month after Council approval. But for the thing we are trying to exercise our discretion to move, oh no, we would be in breach. We have to have the by-laws. It seems an awfully inconsistent interpretation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The response.

Sherwood Armbruster: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you to Councillor Mayes and members of Council, I do want to, again, thank the Public Service for the extensive consultation, communication that has been ongoing in preparation for today's meeting over the previous weeks with CMHC in order to provide Council with the agenda and the report including Motion 1 that is before you today. Advise that the distinction in section 6.3 is explicit in that it requires Council approval of the Infrastructure Program by December 15th, 2025. While sections 1.5 and 1.6 require legalization, the as-of-right…rights proposed in 1.5 and 1.6, won't be legal. And again, the word specifically used is 'legalization' in those two clauses, until a by-law is enacted. So, to hit the milestone deadline, Council would need to hold public hearings, approve the amendments and enact by-laws by June 12th, 2025.

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

Councillor Mayes: It would appear we were able to turn around the by-laws. In fact, they're in front of us today, as a matter of fact, based on a hearing of three weeks ago. November…malls and corridors by-laws are in front of us today, correct? As amended with several amendments made by Council. So, there is no need for us to have a hearing in March in order to get by-laws approved by June 12th. I mean, obviously, there isn't. We just had a 24-hour long…and that will be dwarfed by the week-long, two-week long fortnight on four-plexes. Obviously, we don't need to have that in March in order to have by-laws ready by June in that we just had a hearing on the malls and corridors and the by-laws are already here in front of us some six months early.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The response.

Sherwood Armbruster: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to Councillor Mayes, certainly, as a public service, we stand by ready to do everything within our power to implement the will of Council, Council's decision today. That said, I have provided in writing as well as here in response to the question that we do believe the requirements and timelines would be in jeopardy. The conversations would need to occur that have occurred over the past week with CMHC, with Legal Services, it would be…it would put the timeline at serious risk.

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

Councillor Mayes: So, if one had a public hearing, the week-long, the two-week long, at the end of May, at the start of June and certainly by June 12th, we could have the by-laws in front of us then given the turnaround time we just seen on the malls and corridors. There's no need for us to do this in March. There's no need…there's no legal requirement for us to do it in March at all. So, if you are saying, unlike the thing you were just about to vote on, the infrastructure, where you can delay the by-laws a month and that is okay. Whereas, this other thing, you can't delay the by-laws at all. Fine. So, I have to agree with that.

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

Councillor Mayes: We certainly could have, then, public hearing in the last week of May and still be in compliance as long as we've got the by-laws done by June 12th.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Sure, Madam Speaker. I wasn't exactly prepared. I assumed there were others to speak with. Nonetheless, Councillor Mayes, it appears, has made a good point. We're saying it has to be done by a certain time, therefore, we need a certain amount of time to have the by-laws prepared. But are we saying it's three months that we need? Because we're saying…we're implying sort of here that it has…we have to have everything done by March in order to have the by-laws prepared by June before June 12th. How long does it take him to prepare the by-laws from the last Council meeting when we've dealt with malls and corridors? How many weeks was that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The response?

Sherwood Armbruster: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you to Councillor Schreyer, thank you for the question. And again, together with the Public Service and prepared to work with Legal Services, the discussions with CMHC vis-à-vis the agreement that is before us and Council has approved and the Public Service has approved. I am not here…I'm not able to provide legal advice, certainly, as I was here through the malls and corridors session and the marathon session and would be prepared to consult with the Public Service, Legal Services, City Clerks to expedite. But the Motion No. 2 that is before you, I do stand by the distinction that I've provided to Council in writing as well as in answer to the previous questions that it would put…it would put the timelines at serious risk.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I think you've answered the question. Councillor Eadie moves a motion to move past 12:00 just while we're having this debate. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. I'm going to move to Councillor Eadie. There have been several questions asked. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Oh, I put…

Madam Speaker: Oh, you…it was just for the working past 12:00. That's fine.

Councillor Eadie: Well, I'll just clarify with this, Madam Speaker. I'll just clarify it with the…

Madam Speaker: We'll be taking a recess shortly. There's been two requests. There's some engagement at around 1:20 p.m. for a member of Council had asked for recess just shortly, not just at 12:00. So, we're going to wait for a little bit.

Councillor Eadie: I mean, I just have a quick question. It's probably more for the Clerk, but the CAO knows process because he comes from Clerks. There is nothing stopping Council after the hearing to have a special meeting to specifically only vote on some by-laws, is that correct?

Madam Speaker: Yes, question of clarification for our Clerk.

Councillor Eadie: Well, the CAO could answer it.

Madam Speaker: At this time, we're going to have questions for our CAO. And I want to wrap this up. A few questions have been asked. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm just looking at the records, which we're all rather aware. Our last Council meeting in which we passed our malls and corridors, was November 21st. And today is December 12th. It's the 12th of the month, just like we're talking about June 12th being our final…final day. Therefore, it seems to me, that to play it safe…I am not saying that the by-laws were completed this morning on December 12th. I give the administration much more credit than that. So, we've got to…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, the question and I think it's already been asked.

Councillor Schreyer: Therefore, Madam Speaker, would it not be safe to say that to be safe, according to what we've heard today by the administration, that it would be safe to say, we…logically we could have this all done by, therefore, May 21st in order to have it done by June 12th? Because we just went through November 21st to December 12th? I mean, I'm assuming that the administration will get it done earlier than today and that would be within sort of conventional ability.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer? Anything further to add, Mr. CAO, about the timeline? You have…you have shared what you're in receipt of.

Sherwood Armbruster: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, I would just…I would just repeat that in order to provide the information before you today, there has been extensive consultation with CMHC, Legal Services, City Clerks. The motion…the second motion before you, I have provided the recommendation from the Public Service. And there has been consultation with Legal Services, HAF team. Beyond that, conversations with Clerks and CMHC has not occurred. So, I cannot offer an opinion on that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I apologize, I do have a couple of questions. To understand tranche two of HAF funding is still coming in Q1 regardless of any of this, what is going on now?

Sherwood Armbruster: That is in the report for you, yes.

Councillor Browaty: So, really, we're debating being able to vote for a potential part three, if the liberal government happens to win the election next year and the HAF program still exists?

Sherwood Armbruster: So, the amendment before you is, put forward a Public Service recommendation in consultation with CMHC in order to ensure that that funding is received and that we are not in breach of the agreement.

Councillor Browaty: Why does the Public Service feel it's better to shift funding to grants as opposed to in the ground infrastructure?

Sherwood Armbruster: The…so, the recommendation of Public Service is to ensure that on the basis of an Accelerated Housing Program, that we are able to build housing in response to the housing crisis in our city and get shovels in the ground as soon as possible.

Councillor Browaty: Do you believe our previous motions on HAF suggest that we are trying to get into the housing business?

Sherwood Armbruster: I can't comment on that, but it is a federal funding program that we've signed on that agreement at the direction and support of Council.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you.

Sherwood Armbruster: Thank you, councillor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That…Councillor Rollins. Sorry, it was Councillor Mayes, then Councillor Rollins. Okay, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: You mentioned opposite to Councillor Browaty's question that, you know, that with respect to the housing business. Yet, we do have an agenda item before us, by-law, on affordable housing now. So, I'm going to piggyback on Councillor Browaty's question with respect to the City's housing business.

Sherwood Armbruster: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Mr. CAO.

Sherwood Armbruster: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you to Councillor Rollins, yes, thank you for your support and for your championing this issue of the investments in housing in our city. It is a well documented need within our city and all levels of government are working together on this. And this is an important initiative. And that is…and it is in that spirit and context that this motion is before you. And would like to, again, through Councillor Sharma, thank Council for your support. And the public recommendation is in support of your leadership in that regard.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes. No further questions, Councillor Mayes? Okay.

Councillor Mayes: To piggyback on Councillor Rollins' question, I think Councillor Browaty said, there was a report prepared by the civil service that was approved by EPC that contains the phrasing, "Council directed the Public Service to report back before the end of 2024. However, recent administrative changes from CMHC and potential uncertainty regarding continuation of HAF beyond 2025 have increased the risk requiring the City to proceed incrementally to match expected revenues. Aware of a potential financial risk, that the Public Service will proceed to ensure that HAF expenditures do not exceed." So, what seems to me, we are proceeding with the infrastructure noting this risk or, in fact, we aren't proceeding with the infrastructure, we're delaying it a year, which is a good idea because, as you yourself say, your staff say, there's a risk we might not get the third tranche. But on the other stuff, we have to have a hearing and we have to have it and we have to act as if the money is going to be there. So, Councillor Schreyer's question is well put, which is, it's 21 days since we had this special Council meeting that approved the malls and corridors. The by-laws were clearly not prepared today, they've been published for some time. So, the by-laws can certainly be prepared in under three weeks. So, worst-case scenario. And I certainly don't conclude that the by-laws…by-laws on some stuff can come after, but on your thing, they have to come before.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, the question.

Councillor Mayes: So, certainly, if we had a hearing in late May, the staff, based on what we're seeing literally here today in front of us, the staff would have by-law changes ready for the 12th of June 2025.

Madam Speaker: Anything more to add, Mr. CAO?

Sherwood Armbruster: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you for your comment, councillor.

Madam Speaker: That concludes question period under this topic for the CAO. No, we've asked enough questions of clarification. Thank you. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, Madam Speaker. Obviously, I'll be supporting Item No. 1. I think…and I thank our CAO for his time, his comments in responding to that. So, given that, you know, Legal has indicated the by…that the by-laws need to come in June. I think we will be happy for us today, and the first motion, I think, clarifies it. And it's…frankly, it's been a lot of hard work with our staff, my office staff, CMHC, Minister Frasier's office and others to get some clarity related to this. I think that, you know, what's important too, is we don't have four separate agreements, to my knowledge, on the Housing Accelerator Fund. We have an agreement with Parks, but we have an agreement. What we have before us here in the last 'whereas' of Motion 1 is that CMHC recently advised the Public Service they're supportive of the City approving the principals and infrastructure program and on and on. So, I thank colleagues for support on this. I appreciate Councillors Mayes and Orlikow and their motion. I am not going to support it, and here is why. We're having a lot of discussion, obviously, about the four fours that are coming. It certainly needs to hit a hearing. There's going to be much public debate. The public is already kind of getting ready for it. I know colleagues, especially Councillor Mayes, to his credit, he even had some kind of open houses in the neighbourhood to inform area residents of what may be coming and to provide some information as he had it. And again, more discussion to come on the fours and fours. But I go back to this, is that we don't be know what is going to happen in the future with a…with an election. What we do have before us is an agreement that we entered into for the housing accelerator funding. I do not want to risk, make a decision, that may risk the second round or the second HAF, rounds three and four of that housing accelerator funding. 60 million dollars. Not only that, but the Federal Government has indicated…this current Federal Government has indicated that to not complete, to not fulfill the housing accelerator funding agreement as we have signed on to, could put at risk the opportunity to access funding for the Canada Housing Infrastructure Fund, which is a six billion dollar infrastructure fund, one billion of which cities have direct accesses to. Five billion of which has to go through provincial governments. In addition to that, transit funding, as well, that the feds have an envelope for. The leader of the opposition in Ottawa, who many think may be successful in the next election, whether he is or whomever is successful; the leader of the opposition, a year ago, indicated very clearly through a private member's bill, that didn't pass in the House of Commons. That he was giving indication not only would he cancel the Canada Housing Infrastructure Fund and the HAF and the transit fund, but would even tie conditions to the gas tax, the Canada Community Building Fund, that we do rely upon as municipalities. So, not only would there be no new funding, but the funding we do get will be completely tied up with caveats and conditions all along that funding. Notwithstanding what Federal Government is trying to do and opposition would do, what we are trying to do in this city, and I do appreciate the support of colleagues, is get doors built, get units built as quick as possible. To the answer to…if I heard Councillor Mayes' question correctly, the answer is, why would we vote in favour of him being okay with a delay on the infrastructure fund, 600 and some units to what we have what's before us, is because what is before us in Motion 1 gets more units built faster. Now, it gets shovel ready projects approved to get out the door. And then, in addition, which will compound and have more units built in the future, we can approve the infrastructure fund, which would open up more units and more development throughout the city. That, however, those units would not be able to come online until future years because first you have to do the upgrades to the infrastructure. Then somewhere down the road, once that infrastructure is upgraded, then and only then in some future state would they be able to be build more units in those areas where you've upgraded the infrastructure. So, to get units built now, I appreciate that we all agree going with the Public Service recommendation and the amendment to…amendment one, gets more units built quicker in this time and in this place. At this point, without clarity, complete clarity, I for one, do not want to risk access to significant federal funding that may be available to the City of Winnipeg to get needed infrastructure built. And I'm not talking about small pipes to put a unit or two out somewhere, but major infrastructure funding. An envelope of six billion dollars that still right now is on the table and available to municipalities. When we've got big projects like, obviously, we're trying to still work on the North End plan to get funding for that project from the Federal Government. But we have Route 90 projects to do, a report on Chief Peguis Trail, the Arlington Bridge, several significant big ticket infrastructure projects that we know we as city cannot go alone. We know that they are growth enabling projects. They enable the city of Winnipeg to continue to grow, to accommodate its growth. And so, to me, two month delay to have a hearing related to the fours and fours is a big risk. And frankly, it's too big a risk when the potential, to me, is significant financial dollars that we may not have access to. And so, I won't be supporting Motion 2. I will be supporting amending Motion 1. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, we will vote on the motions in reverse order. First we'll vote on Motion 2. Moved by…call for a recorded vote. It was moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Orlikow, asking for the timing delay. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Browaty, Dobson, Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Chambers, Duncan, Lukes, Rollins and Santos.

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 2 passes. Now Motion 1: moved by the Mayor and seconded by Councillor Rollins. The amending motion. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Now, the main item, as amended. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. And Councillor Browaty recorded in opposition. We will now going to take a recess. Is there…does that request still stand, Councillor Allard, that you needed some time? That stands, okay. So, we are going to take recess now and reconvene at 1:30 p.m. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
December 12, 2024, at 1:40 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of December 12th, 2024. We're on reports of the Executive Policy Committee from December 4th, 2024. Item 12, Madam Clerk.

Item 12 – Proposed Opening and Rededication of Public Walk Plan 43984 between Strongberg Drive and De Vries Avenue, as McIvor Avenue – DAO 2/2023

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

Mayor Gillingham: Hi, yeah, I'll wait to hear from my colleagues. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. A couple of quick comments to put on the record here. This is one of the oldest and longest standing stories of the North Kildonan Ward. Perhaps one of the reasons I got elected in the first place. So, I would be remiss if I didn't put a couple of comments here on the record. Prior to my election, there was a councillor from the Transcona Ward that lived on this particular street. The area councillor closed it off to Lagimodiere Boulevard to put pressure on to all sort of other streets throughout the North Kildonan Ward. There were public meetings about it, not necessarily thrown by the councillor. It was a very unpopular decision at the time. So, one of my very first 2006 election campaign platform planks was the re-opening of McIvor at Lagimodiere. I would not have believed if you told me at the time how far that issue resonated beyond the immediate area of McIvor and Lagimodiere, or Bonner, or Gilmore, or De Vries, or people on McLeod, Oakland who said, I support you about this McIvor Avenue issue. Anyways, at the time it physically got opened, we didn't deal with the issue of the legal opening. It was punted to the Public Service. 18 years later, we are now dealing with the official legal opening of that street. So, I'm very much in support of this. It's a paper…you know, it's not a very formal thing at this point, but again, in March of 2007, the roadway physically opened. It's been open since. There are, perhaps, still some changes happening to the centre median at McIvor and Lagimodiere restricting certain turn movements coming next year when De Vries is repaved from right here at McIvor through to Headmaster. But again, very local issue and a very important one for the North Kildonan community. I couldn't let this go without saying something.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty, for that history. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: I think I speak for all of us, Madam Speaker, that we hope that Councillor Browaty will include that on his update to his ward residents' flier. Just to show a before and after picture. So, you can call the question. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Calling the question. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Next is by-laws under Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Mayor.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. I move that By-law No. 142/2024 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 142/2024.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I move that the following by-laws be read a second time: By-law No. 95/2024 and By-law No. 117/2024.

Madam Speaker: And that's second and third reading. Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 95/2024, By-law No. 117/2024.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much. I move that the By-law No. 95/2024 and By-law No. 117/2024 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 101/2024, By-law No. 130/2024, By-law No. 131/2024, By-law No. 136/2024, By-law No. 137/2024, By-law No. 138/2024, By-law 143/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Mayes: Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Mayes: Just on a point of order, I think.

Madam Speaker: Madam Clerk. Madam Clerk, yeah.

Councillor Mayes: There's an effective screen from the (inaudible) player there. The…all of the six…there were six amendments passed at the time of the public hearing to what had been proposed. Councillor Duncan's business with the changing of the map, a number of other amendments. Councillor Orlikow had an amendment. All of those are incorporated in the by-laws, I'm assuming. As far as I can tell. I could find some of them, but not all. But I assume they were all there.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, are you able to clarify?

City Clerk: That is our understanding.

Madam Speaker: All of the amendments during the public hearing. Call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor.

Clerk: By-law No. 101/2024, By-law No. 130/2024, By-law No. 131/2024, By-law No. 136/2024, By-law No. 137/2024, By-law No. 138/2024, By-law 143/2024.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: This is the second reading, correct?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that By-law No. 101/2024, By-law No. 130/2024, By-law 131/2024, 136/2024, 137/2024, 138/2024, and 143/2024 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 101/2024, 130/2024, 131/2024, 136/2024, 137/2024, 138/2024, and 143/2024.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: And I move that the rule be suspended and that By-law Nos. 101/2024, 130/2024, 131/2024, 136/2024, 137/2024, 138/2024, and 143/2024 be read a third a 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. The clock please. Councillor Gilroy, then Councillor Eadie.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question…I'd like for the Mayor is I'm really concerned that we still do not have a CAO. It's been a while since our…I know we have an Interim CAO, but it's been a while since we've had a regular CAO and I think it's really important for staff, the integrity of Council, to ensure that we have somebody at the realm. I think it makes the Mayor more powerful, with an Interim CAO, and I also thinks that that there's less direction for staff and somebody for them to go to. So, I do want to ask where we are at in the process of finding a CAO and what he thinks the timelines are going to be.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the councillor for the question, gives me an opportunity to thank our Interim CAO who's doing an outstanding job. For all of our staff…and I think that some of the even changes that he has led regarding the workforce management review have been really, really excellent, and so I commend Mr. Armbruster for his work. I thank him that he's not in caretaker mode right now while we're looking for a new CAO, but just applaud his effort and his work. Thank you so much, through you, Madam Speaker. We are in the process as a city, I've identified an RFP went out, identifying basically a search firm to assist the City of Winnipeg as soon as we have that search firm determined. That will be public knowledge. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Does the Mayor have a timeline on when that search firm will be picked. I'm sure it doesn't take that long for a…when can we expect to see a search firm that's picked?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I don't have a date, but soon.

Madam Speaker: Final question.

Councillor Gilroy: My final question is, in one of the reports that I got to…from the Parks and Community Services, talked about…the hiring and deployment of two crews to monitor park locations from April to October, and the cost of that time of this report, and I'm asking the Mayor this because I think if we had a CAO, this might've been…something that would've

been caught. Is that 193,704, and the cost that's coming out of the budget working group to have the same crews for the same time period, there's only 66,000. So, large discrepancy, and I want to know if the Mayor can maybe look into…

Madam Speaker: One question, Councillor Gilroy. Yeah.

Councillor Gilroy: …if the Mayor can look into ensuring that these reports are coming through, and really honouring the intent of the writers that are writing these reports and asking for reports, that the fair value is weighted when we get the responses.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I thank the councillor for the question. Budget-related question can be asked here, fair, but I do know we have some more time to look into the matter, so, that's something that we could look at together, but I think Councillor to join me in looking into this…get the details of this, but be glad to work with her on that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie then Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thanks Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, CentreVenture is a development corporation and essentially for the downtown of Winnipeg, and…in terms of shareholders, this isn't like The Forks North Portage where we have three different shareholders in that organization. And it's been quite a substantial amount of time, Madam Speaker, since CentreVenture has actually gone out the Board, which is all appointed, I believe, by…through the Mayor's Office. They have not yet hired a permanent, I think it's called an Executive Director, and it's been…what, it's probably been a year and a half and I'd like to know, Madam Speaker, CentreVenture is putting some individuals off about some items that need to be dealt with and they've…they're using the excuse that well, there would be the responsibility of a new Executive Director so, Madam Speaker, when is CentreVenture getting its new Executive Director?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Through you, I want to thank the councillor for the question. I hope soon is the answer to my question. The CentreVenture has their own recruitment process, they have their own recruitment timelines as well, I do hope that soon. CentreVenture will play a key role in the delivery and implementation of CentrePlan 2050 among other things as well. That's the plan. So, I hope to have more information, and I hope to hear more information from CentreVenture very soon. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if His Worship…actually, knows what that timeline is, given that oversight over…I mean, they presented finance but…like, what is their timeline? I hear rumors that not until September of 2025 and I think they've been without a permanent ED now for…by that time, it'll be about two…over two years. So, does the Mayor know the timeline?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I don't have a date for CentreVenture's announcement, I certainly hope it's not as late as September 2025. To me, that would not be good. We need something sooner. So, through you, Madam Speaker to the Councillor, we hope to hear…I hope to hear from CentreVenture, that all of us hear from CentreVenture soon.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, as I believe the Mayor, and/or Interim CAO have the ability to speak to the board. Would the Mayor or Interim CEO venture and push them to start moving faster because I'm hearing by letter it says, it won't be until September 2025?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do not have…that's the first I've heard of September 2025. I'm not sure where (inaudible) my colleagues are getting the information from. Like I said, I'm hoping, we're all hoping, that CentreVenture has an announcement sooner rather than later.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Earlier too, we passed the infrastructure component of Housing Accelerator Fund, that mentions a number of 12 million dollars in total for that fund. I wonder if the Mayor could provide the Council, if not today, in the near future, a breakdown of how the 122 million dollars has been allocated. When we got the "frequently asked questions" document in November of 2023, it had a total of 192 broken down and 35 million was to go to infrastructure. Now as indicated earlier, we got about 60 percent of what we asked for, but clearly, things aren't being proportionately reduced. 60 percent of 35 would be about 21 million, and we're talking 12, which is unfortunate. I'd like to see more go into infrastructure, but perhaps it's going into other, more worthwhile initiatives. Certainly, we've been putting a lot into the grants. It was to be 50 million for the Land Enhancement Office. So, can we get a breakdown of what…is there a breakdown? Is this all being done year to year, how is that 122 million being broken down because we had a very detailed breakdown when we first asked for the money, including 18% of it, 35 million was for infrastructure, now we're down to only 12…

Madam Speaker: Question.

Councillor Mayes: …for infrastructure.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Through you, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the councillor for the question. I will reach out through our CAO…Interim CAO to see if Mr. Mahe or someone within the Housing Accelerator Fund Program can provide that information and then distribute it to everybody. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, next is the Standing Policy Committee on Community Services. Councillor Santos, on the report dated November 28th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED NOVEMBER 28, 2024

Councillor Santos: Yes, Madam Chair, I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items one and two.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We'll get right into question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Santos? Any questions? Okay. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works. Councillor Lukes, our Chair, report dated November 29th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED NOVEMBER 29, 2024

Councillor Lukes: Yes, I move consent of Items one, two, three and four.

Madam Speaker: Did you stand any down, Madam Chair? I will call the question on three and four. All in favour? One and three were stood? Okay, so one is stood down, and two? Councillor Rollins, did you stand down one? Okay, well I heard one. So, four? Okay. So, one is not. And Item two. Arlington Bridge, yeah. Okay, I will call the question on one and three. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 2 – Arlington Street Bridge Over the CPR Yards Rehabilitation Feasibility and Preliminary Design Study

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Madam Chair, your opportunity to introduce.

Councillor Lukes: I'll listen to my colleague first.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, that was you.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I just want to start by hoping that the prime minister and the premier's offices are listening to this speech about the Arlington Bridge that brought great growth to Winnipeg and Manitoba. How they

benefited for over 100 years from the growth that that CP Rail at the time, now CPKC, brought to this city and province, Madam Speaker. So, they have a big stake in this. I heard the Mayor speak about not able to deal with growth. Well, there's some things that I will be talking about in the budget, Madam Speaker, because when we get new properties on, there's some things we need to adjust when we calculate the mill rate. And then, we would have some money for the things that are needed in Waverley West that are still...Arlington Bridge has been how long of a problem? And every time it's near its end, we keep getting this trotted out dream of removing the rails from the city. And I listened to the delegation present some ironies. Yeah, there is poverty around there, Madam Speaker. So, why not help the people who need an opportunity to get the education or learn the skills, Madam Speaker, that they can get a good paying job at CPKC. Because that's what's happened for the North End, Central, West End, Brooklyn is up there, Weston. I know so many people who got a chance to work for CPKC and they made good money and they still do. And so, I hear about the risk of having rail and bitumen running through our city. Yeah, that is a risk. Also, I will let you know, you have all seen the semi-trucks hauling gasoline, dangerous, explosive gasoline on the roads in this city. What are you going to do about that? What are you going to do about the harm to the ecology and the environment? Why don't we move...you know, why aren't we asking to have moved the asphalt plant just outside in Springfield? This right by a bunch of homes, residential properties, it's causing problems. Why don't we move that out into the middle of nowhere so it won't…when it explodes or has an emergency, it is not throwing toxic stuff into the air and other businesses around there? What about the industries right there in St. Boniface? There are dangerous industries there. Chemicals that are highly, highly, you know, toxic. They're not good. So, why aren't we talking about that? We hear these ironies. CPKC and the rail did not create poverty. Poverty...I don't want to get into that detail, I don't have time in my speech. But you know, the irony is, that the people who live in poverty in the North End and Central there, even in the West End. We move back and forth. Even up into your ward into West Kildonan. People move around. They can only afford to ride bikes. They are walking or taking the bus. The Arlington bus service sucks. It has a chance for great improvement. So, when I see that this report got delayed till just before the budget is tabled for 2025 and the capital program from 2025 through to 2030, I think it is. Now, an approach should have been looked at this. It should have been put forth. You know, I think it should have came in September. It would have been ready, I believe. And a plan that said, okay, we will start the beginning of this in '25. Because their plan says six years having to start in 2025, Madam Speaker. The numbers are going to be askew afterwards. So, here we're sending it to this process and also, what is the process? The 2025 capital budget process could be the capital budgets from 2026 to 2031, Madam Speaker. I don't know. It's pretty…it should be started in 2025 in order to have it for 2030. That will be seven years. Over seven years without the use of a bridge. And it will be a better bridge. Where was the plan? We do have room in our debt ceiling to at least take on a third of it. I know that we're going to have to have dialogue with the other two levels, which I hope are listening, Madam Speaker. I will be sending a letter. If nobody is going to do it, I'm going to do it because, you know what? I am not sure the best interests of the North End and the West End and Central and West Kildonan and even as far down into River Heights, Madam Speaker. Because that is a route that people use. So, like, anyway, so we need to deal with this quickly. And just of those in poverty, the Social Planning Council there, their dreams. Poverty. You know, you need opportunities for employment to be able to have the dollars to be able to buy a home. And actually, the odd thing, Madam Speaker, is the people who used to live in those areas of poverty: Weston neighbourhood, the railway and the Shaughnessy Park and William Whyte and Centennial, West Alexander, even north Point Douglas, south Point Douglas, Madam Speaker. You know, those people are people, are residents. The people who live here in Winnipeg, they need opportunities for jobs. That is what our Mayor has been talking about. Now, we're talking here, we've got old growth and we should have been preparing for this for years. We have known for years, Madam Speaker. This is the number one project. It should be moving because the bridge doesn't exist anymore. And even if it does get built or get rid of the railway or whatever, are we going to spend the money to get rid of the Main Street underpass? Are we going to spend the money to get rid of the Slaw Rebchuk Bridge? Are we going to get rid of the underpass? No, because there is traffic that moves all around the city. And if you are going to have a neighbourhood and you don't want all those nasty motor vehicles, you don't need that many things to path, you could have a walkable community where a bridge goes over it or you got an LRT that goes through connecting you to a whole bunch of things. And so…someone going to give me a two-minute?

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

Councillor Eadie: So, the recommendation here is that they are sending the design. The process says to the 2025 Capital Budget process. So, maybe when the Mayor closes, he can explain which process that one is. Because, really, we need about a third of that money to demolish the bridge. Like, we spent a million to fix it, but you know, this winter is going to be crazy. Really warm, really cold, really warm, really cold. Are those things we did to protect the railway from…the bridge falling on the railway? You think it's going to last? No, it's not. The rest of it is going to go nuts because that steel…so, we needed to get moving on that now. And maybe we can amend the capital budget, Madam Speaker, through the process, if that is the process we're talking about, with ideas. And I will remind Council, there is room…Moody's, I think it was, the bond rating agency said we could have a debt ceiling of 110 percent of our revenue. You can put a little holder in there. I don't know how the Province is going to look at it. But that…you know, we put money there and there is a possibility we could borrow money, which, is, you know. But they…they…they need to take on some of this. How much money did it bring into the provincial coffers, that rail yard? Yeah, and how much to the feds, Monsieur Allard? Thank you. So, I am just going to close. There is a way to fit this in. We are going to take a leap of faith, Mr. Mayor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: And let's get it done. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Back to you, Madam Chair, to close. Okay, I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Madam Clerk, Item 4.

Item 4 – Speed Limit Reduction on Wellington Crescent

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, to introduce the item.

Councillor Lukes: I will hear from my colleague.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: I just wanted to stand and thank Councillor Lukes, Madam Speaker. Wellington Crescent is a gap on priority network that needs to be prioritized. It needs to be planned and it needs to be fixed by, I believe, constructing a separated bike lane. And I believe until it's completed, reduce speed to 30-kilometers. Now, Madam Speaker, I know that that didn't pass through EPC and I know that, you know, it did, though, change at Public Works. And so, for that reason, I wanted to stand and talk a bit about its trajectory through Council. We continue to work on the Transportation Master Plan that has a pedestrian and cycling strategy. And we continue to, through those, anticipate other reports that are complimentary like the one coming up next year on 30-kilometer speeds. That, I think, is an opportunity. And while, you know, Madam Speaker, you know, we talk about 30-kilometers here. We talk about slowing down. I think it is important to know that there are, you know, really critical voices, many which we heard this month at Council, that is imploring us to really consider safer…safe…safer streets and safer…safer speeds. I wanted to note, for instance, that, you know, it isn't lost on me that Wellington is an arterial, it's shared by over three wards. I think that, you know, Charleswood can boast a piece of Wellington. Certainly, River Heights-Fort Garry and Fort Rouge-Fort Garry do, as well. The point that has been made that we are looking at residential streets, that…that's true. We will be…I do think we need to consider the Vancouver-like pilot, the Edmonton pilots that really look at arterials, in particular, where there are multiple schools at play, like there is in this section of Wellington with Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry there, St. Mary's School, West Gate, Kelvin, you know, École River Heights and more, to really look at something different on arterials where there are a collection of schools. I count between schools and daycares in the vicinity of kids going back and forth around 10. And so, that…that is what gave rise to the motion. There is more work to do. And Madam Speaker, without belabouring a point, it's hard when you lose a motion. But without belabouring the point, I am grateful for the pedestrian and cycling community that came to talk about road safety, tell some difficult stories at Council. And I expect more opportunities for them in the future given the Transportation Master Plan. I also want to acknowledge the budget that this Council has…has really carved out for the Transportation Master Plan. I think that that deserves credit. And that that actually gets me excited to look at more work with respect to this in the future. It is, you know, out of a protective…it is a protective move that we brought this up through community committee to the Standing Policy Committee. It wasn't intended to be divisive. It was intended to really focus in on an area of safety. And to me, that is what Community Committee is for. It is…it is for really looking at some city policy impacts at a more granular level with community. And that is what we saw take place over the…you know, convening weeks. So, a little disappointed, Madam Speaker, but I am…I do think that there is a lot here to work with and in particular, on Council's Transportation Master Plan. We have a plan. We have priorities articulated in that Wellington Crescent is high priority within the…within the draft bike route priority map. It's climbing higher, we know this. And not only do we have a plan, we've budgeted for that plan, Madam Speaker. And for that, I am grateful to Council.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Well, while I appreciate the words from Councillor Rollins, this was not the motion at Community Committee that we tried to pass before. Working together, even though that motion at Community Committee was walk-on. I put some water in my wine or wine in my water, whatever way you want to look at it and said, okay, but I have a lot going on right now from the Grosvenor portion right now, other way. We have done some pilot projects, we've tried 30k, we've done a whole bunch of things and every time we do it, I always tell the residents, you may not like it, but you had your chance to have your voice heard. You may love it, and you had the (inaudible) for it. You have questions, yes, and here is the evidence, here's the data that we say, okay, so are you people who are on Elm or Ash where you have no sidewalks at all, you are worried about what? You're worried about cars whipping down your street now and crushing people. Absolutely, fair enough. That's a worry. People from the…other people talk about the intermingling between cars and cyclists on Wellington Crescent. That is why, even though I guess many people told me not to do it, because it's going to piss off all the people. We actively really have been working on this issue for quite a while now. And we've done things like we did the one block…one blockage, that was terrible. We tried it for one year, we had…it really didn't be work at all. So, then we tried a new model. And then we started doing 30Ks on the bridge mouths on the

other side. Well, that has actually had some impacts. Again, let's be honest, the reason why we are not having…we're here today, and the reason why it got walked on, in my opinion, it should have had a report. But I…now, I've had a chance after to talk to the Public Service. They don't support it. They don't for many different reasons, but we never asked them for a report. So, councillors, I'm going to tell you myself, and you heard it today, I had a gentleman today, he was quite angry, he would like us just to drop it to 30 on his street. They may actually petitioned Public Works a while back to do that. They just said, no, we have to wait for a report. We're going to have some consultation with the neighbourhood. So, that's why it came to a little bit surprise that that wasn't the same accord offered to people on Wellington Crescent. So be it, that's the way this Council works sometimes. But at the end of the day, I am quite happy with the motion today. I think the motion today is very good. It's going to really…people, we have to make sure Wellington Crescent can be very fast. My problem, though, is and I haven't had the research, I'm still trying to find it. Arbitrarily lowering it, like we talked…they talked about arbitrarily doing things. And Council said, well, arbitrarily just lowering again, I want to know the impacts. I know I've got a lot of phone calls with people who are getting…who almost get smooshed because their car is going the 30K on a double street and the other car whips around them on the inside lane because they are frustrated. I can't control those drivers. And that's, actually, where all the cyclists are. So, I'm not sure if I agree to that until we actually get the infrastructure to separate these two. I may be, but I need to have some data. I need to actually have the opportunity to talk to people so they trust the process going forward. I met with Bike Winnipeg previously and we talked about educating residents. I totally agreed with that. We need to educate some residents. But again, now I am being told by Bike Winnipeg, don't educate the residents, just do what we want. Well, again, so which way is it? I don't know, but I know what I know. What I know is, we are not traffic engineers. We know that fish are like…fish are like in water, they are going to go where the least resistance is. So, you put a blocker on one spot, now are they going to go down Cockburn Street? Are they going to come down Dorchester? Where are they going to go? Again, a report would have given us some ideas on that and just maybe, for example, like the gentleman we talked to today…present today where it's a street in River Heights. There's actually some mitigation measures that are like six blocks away because of the impact how this works. Again, that we presented to the committee. They want to do it a lot quicker. I understand that. I would have never guessed Public Service would have come by with some of these ideas, but they did. They're not so bad, but again, we're going to meet with residents in the neighbourhood, we're going to meet in general, we're going to have an open house, we're going to talk about it and then we'll go with their was facts with traffic engineers assessments and with the residents having their say. So, again, I do…I got really concerned when we said, my word was getting taken out of…I couldn't believe that this happened. That we would just arbitrarily change the speed limit in someone else's ward without even talking to him. And then, all of a sudden, that's what it is. I never…some residents actually told me, who really do not like me much, that this is your plan. This is what you are planning to do to us. Well, now I'm going to have a really hard time saying, well, this wasn't our plan. No, we don't know what way we're going yet. So, let's just calm down. I know people want to do the 30K. I do, I'm not dismissing the idea, but I need to have a little more information. I need to have collaboration with different councillors. I also asked Councillor Duncan and Councillor Rollins. Her point over on her side, I wasn't too keen on that one, but again, she agreed at the time that we would not go down the other side of Wellington Crescent. So, I said, okay. Again, I probably won't do that again in the future. Now, because, again, I don't know what's going to happen in that section right now and how much traffic will go by. So, again, I respect that 30K saves lives. I also know that traffic is going to flow down into residential streets. We talked…already had talked about the different schools. It's already I'm hearing calls about Kingsway, the pick up in cars, because Academy, it's getting really, really full. That is just happening period. So, that is why we only did those for those bridge months to see what the impact was. The summer is not bad. This may shock you, a few people in River Heights go to the cabin. So, the actual traffic volumes go down enough in the summer that we actually look at data and it actually could be warranted. So, again, I understand that what is coming from the people is passion, but we can't just go with passion because traffic is very serious. Both…and mostly for safety. We can't just say, well, that is a great idea period and discount everything else that we have to look at. So, again, I think this is something for me I'll be taking by later on. I have no intention of going to any of your wards and either increasing or lowering your speed limits arbitrarily. Just telling you that right now. And I hope you all have the same respect for me. Don't do that. Let's work together to try and make sure how we get this going forward.

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Jot down some notes here and I wanted to speak in support of the ongoing discussions around lowering speed limits in our entire city. Conversation that I was proud to initiate during my first term as a member of the Public Works Committee. I think Councillor Browaty, I can't remember who else was on that committee, but we brought up the debate about lowering speed limits, keeping the speed limits the same in residential…residential streets. So, back then, we know it sparked massive debate amongst Winnipeggers. For weeks it seemed like everyone had an opinion about it. We did polls or our newspapers actually did polls and my office was actually inundated with e-mails telling me that I was crazy. What are you doing lowering speed limits? Don't do that, it's a crazy idea and don't even think about suggesting it. But I pushed back because I knew then that…as I know now, that lowering speed limits does save lives. And I do believe that to this day. The data is clear and the evidence is compelling. However, I want to emphasize that reducing speed limit is not a panacea. It's a part of a broader strategy that must include real, significant infrastructure changes to slow drivers down and make our streets safer for everyone. So, I want to share a little

bit of a personal story that happened in my own constituency on Isabel Street in my first term. Where a 7-year-old boy was actually hit at a pedestrian lighted intersection by a distracted driver. You know, it was heartbreaking at the time, it still is heartbreaking. And when I hear about vehicular and pedestrian incidences that have occurred across the city, you know, it's never good to hear about things that happened. But I advocated back then for some meaningful changes. We didn't actually lower the speed limits, but we made substantial infrastructure improvements in that community and they embraced it wholeheartedly. These changes didn't just improve safety, they also reshaped the way people think about and use that space. Isabel is a major route. And it demonstrated to me that when we invest in thoughtful design and capital improvements, we can effectively change driver behaviour and create safer streets without always needing to adjust speed limits. That said, I also believe we must listen to our residents. In the last term, we did exactly that. Through stakeholder engagement, public consultation, we heard from Winnipeggers who had serious concerns about lowering speed limits. We listened to them and as a result, we conducted pilot projects in several areas across the city. And this pilot project and the report will give us valuable insight. So, we fast forward today and we are hoping that in the first quarter of next year, we will have a report before us that offers a path forward. One that I hope will lay the framework…sorry, will lay the groundwork for thoughtful recommendations about speed limits in residential areas. This isn't just about responding to the dead or listening to the loudest voices, it's about creating a safer, more livable Winnipeg for everyone. So, the motion before us represents the perspective that I brought from my own experiences within my own constituency. It's a request for an interim solution to improve safety for cyclists with a temporary approach. Hopefully, we can use the poly-posts or paintings and signage until a permanent infrastructure can be installed. This is a balanced approach that I think can be successful if we come together and support it. But I want to emphasize something, that this street is not among the most dangerous intersections in Winnipeg for pedestrians. According to a report that was prepared by a very thoughtful Yarl Vierra, I don't know if I'm saying that name right, but a transportation equity analysis. 85 percent of the highest fatal major and minor pedestrian injuries occurred in City Centre and in the North End. So, while I can appreciate that this neighbourhood will benefit from temporary fixes, I must ask, what about the neighbourhoods that truly need these improvements the most? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak in favour of the Executive Policy Committee recommendation. But I just wanted to speak to it because I spoke at EPC and just mentioned that I made a…I made a mistake in terms of…I didn't make mistake because it was in somebody else's ward, Madam Speaker. What happened was, I don't actually believe in, when you have P1s like Isabel or I understand a section of Wellington Crescent is like a P1. The other part is like a major P2. You know, oddly, Scotia is a P2. There is a bus route down there. But the amount of traffic, Madam Speaker, is like, I don't know, not even a tenth probably, of what happens on Wellington Crescent going through west of…you know, west of Academy Road and at the Maryland Bridge. Madam Speaker, you know, I have been an avid cyclist back when I could see to work, everywhere. I rode everywhere, Madam Speaker, except in the winter, I took the bus. And I have been a blind pedestrian on the streets of Winnipeg now for going on 41 years, Madam Speaker. And the younger you are, the easier it is to deal with. The streets are also getting much noisier, too. But Madam Speaker, accidents happen because people make a mistake or they are not following the rules. And pedestrians do it, cyclists do it and drivers do it. These are the people. But the…you know, you are driving a motor vehicle, that can be a weapon, which it was utilized in spurring on the idea of 30kph along Wellington Crescent. Now, I am all for and, you know, it could be a city councillor's decision or not. We have a pilot that's coming back. We might be voting to make all P3 residential streets 30 or 40kph. I am okay with that, Madam Speaker. Honestly, I am. But when we have major P2s like Wellington Crescent or, I would say, Jefferson, although Jefferson does have a 30kph through a school zone. Because a P2 is still considered to be a residential street. Again, Jefferson, even at peak hours, doesn't come anywhere near to what Wellington Crescent is on either side of Academy Road. So, I don't know whatever plan comes forward, because I don't believe in making it 30kph when you have so many motor vehicles that use it. And it's kind of how the areas are made up of. Like, the thing is, if you don't...if you don't…you've got lots of options through my ward. You've got Main Street, you've got McGregor, you've got Salter, you don't have Arlington right now. And then you've got McPhillips, which nobody wants to take, the parking lot. But so I am supportive of 30kph. So, I made a mistake in that I forgot to put into consideration what kind of streets these are that we are talking about. Now, what has come out of and what we did move out of Public Works, we are still talking about putting in the temporary protectionary whatever they are. Those kind of things to separate it so that there is a safe place for cyclists who ride. Wellington Crescent sidewalks are pretty good, as I last recall. As a matter of fact, I think there is a walkway right down the boulevard on Wellington Crescent when you're west of Academy all the way up to, I can't remember the street again. And then you can walk across over into Omand's Creek Park. You know, Wellington Crescent's great connections too for cyclists, right. But it…what we need are protected bike lanes. That's what we need on P1 streets, protected bike lanes. And we need to continue to...we need to…I don't know. Maybe I'm going to…I will probably spend money out of councillor budget…ward allowance next year. We've got to educate people. Like, when I heard some of these cyclists talking about undertaking activities that antagonize somebody who's driving a 5,000-pound vehicle. We were taught to respect and ride single file. I heard this guy talking about using a strategy to prevent vehicles from going in and out and, you know, taking…going into a space where there might be a cyclist who is not near the curb. Well, they were talking about blocking off three or four bikes across. Traveling at, what, 25-kilometers an hour

maybe? You're going to cause weeding. Exactly what I heard Mr. West didn't want to happen. Like, where do these people come up with this stuff? I just…you need to respect all who use the roads. Again, if everybody followed the rules and didn't make any mistakes in terms of even though they were following and something happened. We would probably be really close to that zero that I know our chairperson strongly holds the view of. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes to close. Or Councillor Browaty first.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I will be fairly brief. I just want to say, I do support the motion from EPC. I don't support 50-kilometers an hour…sorry, I don't support 30-kilometres an hour on Wellington Crescent. I'll be fair, I do not support driving 150-kilometers an hour on any street within the city of Winnipeg. I think penalties for that should be very severe and very harsh anywhere in the city of Winnipeg for driving 150-kilometers an hour. I generally would be a little remiss asking the Public Service to go off their pedestrian cycling strategy in terms of the roll out of improvements. But I do believe this is a particularly important piece of the network within the city of Winnipeg to connect to various parts of…other parts of the city. The people in this room, my colleagues, you may be shocked to learn I have biked on Wellington Crescent before. And I do believe that…with Councillor Allard, in fact, and I do see that, you know, the connections through Assiniboine Park, through to, you know, the Stradbrook…Sherbrook and Maryland bridges and into downtown is an important part of the AT network. And I will support these interim measures, as well. So, those are just my comments for the record. Again, I support photo radar even beyond where it is currently allowed, as long as speed limits are reasonable. If you were to set it at 30-kilometres an hour on it tomorrow, I would say that that is a trap and an attempt to try and take money from taxpayers. Where speed limits are appropriate, I support photo radar. So, I will just leave it at that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes, our chair, to close.

Councillor Lukes: Sure. Thank you very much. Well, a lot…a lot has been said about this. A lot has been said about the 30-kilometre, 40-kilometre. A lot of councillors want 30 and 40-kilometres on various streets in their wards. I see that as a very positive sign. The pendulum swings here at city hall. It swung really far and I think it's landed in a good spot for Wellington Crescent in the short-term. We're going to see some short-term solutions put in. I think that is a huge win. You know, as Councillor Allard said, we are in it for the long haul. We've…some of us, as I'm…you're probably tired of me saying this, but starting out at 100,000 dollars in the budget, in the entire budget, 20 years ago and now, we are at 97 million. There is hope. There is hope, right? There is hope. I know. But you know what, every time I sit here and I think of the times I would come down and anyways, it's all good. So, I'm happy with where we're ending up here. We do have the 30, 40-kilometre report coming forward. I think that will be very interesting. We'll have lots of discussions on that. But we all know that slower speeds saves lives and I think that is a direction many of us here are moving towards. So, and I looked it up. I had to look it up. Councillor Santos was on Public Works, it was in 2005. And it was June…not 2005. Put my glasses on. 2015. June 2023 when we started talking about 30-kilometre an hour. And I had to dance right over that one. That rattled me. That was in the first year and I think, you know, it still has happened, right. So, we are moving the dial. We're moving the…we're moving the speedometer, slow and sure. But I am pleased where we ended up with Wellington Crescent on this. So, that's all I'll have to say. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thanks. With that, call the question on Item four. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Onto question period under this committee. Any questions for our chair? Okay. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Finance and Economic Development. Councillor Browaty, our chair.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 27, 2024

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move the report of March…sorry, November 27th, and move reports one and two.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Also, onto question period right away under this committee. Councillor Lukes.

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

Councillor Lukes: Could you, Councillor Browaty, update us on the TIPP Program. I know I've had some calls on people questioning why their TIPP rate went down and, for the last six months, it's related, of course, I know now what it's related to. But maybe just give us a recap on what's happening with TIPP.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and thank you very much to my colleague for that question. And through you to Councillor Lukes, and to all my council colleagues. As a reminder, Winnipeg property taxes are due on…at the end of June every year. We set our budget, we apply a mill rate, and that's how we determine what taxes are collected from Winnipeggers. The same also happens for the school divisions. They set their mill rates, and we as a Council have to accept those mill rates and we collect the funds for the school divisions as well. What's happened in 2023 was under the Progressive Conservative government, a cheque was sent out to every residential property owner equivalent to 50 percent of the education taxes paid on their property. In 2024, with the change in government, a political promise was made to not send out cheques, but to apply the discount or the 50 percent credit of the education taxes to people's property tax bills. So effectively, the premier…the Province sent to the City of Winnipeg 50 percent of your education taxes in 2024. We didn't know that when we set the property tax rates at the beginning of 2024. So if you look at your payments from January through June, it'll be one amount, and then July, that amount went down significantly. For me, it was a couple hundred bucks a month. That represents taking the entirety of that 50 percent education tax credit and applying it to over six payments for the remainder of the year. They changed it again yet for 2025. Now, residents are…single family home residents, or residential property owners are going to get a 1500 dollar-credit from the Province of Manitoba for their education taxes. If your property…if your education taxes are only 1400 dollars, you're going to get a 1400 dollar- credit. If your education taxes are six thousand dollars, you're going to get a 1500 dollar-credit. So some people will get more, some people will get less. However, they will be incorporating that into all of your payments in 2025. So, your payments probably in January probably…will probably be less than they were in January of…no, it's not…yeah, probably, they probably should be less than in January of 2025 than what they were in January 2024. However, they won't…and then what will change in July will only reflect what the City and your school division has done. I'm sure this is still confusing. There was a press release went out this morning. I think we need some explainer videos and some better explanations as to what it's going to mean. However, due to the mail strike, the Assessment and Taxation department does have a website set up. It can find any of your previous property tax bills, there's log in information on there, it'll even estimate what your taxes will be starting…what your TIPP payments will be in January. Again, if you pay your taxes in full every year in June, this really doesn't impact you. It didn't impact you…for this…for 2024. But again, the majority of Winnipeggers are on the TIPP program where, effectively, you're pre-paying your property taxes for the first 6 months, and for the…and then you're…paying the rest over the…the last 6 months of the year. If anybody needs an explanation, I can show you somebody's property tax bill, I'll show you my own property tax bill, and I can explain it to you more thoroughly. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for that. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, I do have a question regarding the…sorry, I'm having a really hard time seeing without my glasses. Would the Building Canada's fund…and I found out that we don't apply for it, but we do look at capital projects that we don't need to maybe go into debt for. So my question to you is, in the budget line, I think, if you can maybe…you might not know this off-hand, so maybe you can get back to me. In the budget book, I think in Councillor Duncan's ward, there is a cover for an ice rink that last year, I think was Land Dedication dollars from his own ward allowance, and now this year, it's covered under…under this…the Building's Cana…if that, yeah, like information, maybe I'm not correct on that. I just want information, how we're using this fund and if it's being used to…what projects is being used on this here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the question. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. I think the…my colleague's referring to the Canada Community-Building Fund, which in fact is what the gas tax was formerly known as. It's one of the most flexible and appreciated grant programs in any level of government in the country. It's quite flexible and that it can be used towards capital funding for a fairly large swath of different types of projects. You can use it for roads, water and sewer infrastructure, recreation infrastructure. What the City of Winnipeg does every year is…and if you look at your supplement to the budget, there's a section, well, every project shows the funding source. Sometimes it's going to be debt, sometimes it's cash to capital, sometimes it'll be frontage levy for projects that are eligible for frontage levy. But quite often, you'll see the projects will be tagged as being from the Canada Community-Building Fund. So those are projects where we're effectively paying cash. We like…my understanding is Corporate Finance generally likes to do smaller, shorter-term projects with that funding. We do use it sometimes even

for payments on P3's, that's another place where we do use that Canada Community-Building Fund money, but I can assure you it is accounted for, all of it every year, and we do take advantage of all the money from the federal government. We don't apply for it separately. We do apply it through the budget process to projects across the city.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, yeah. So when you're looking back into that, because my second question related to that is, when something gets put into the budget books and it's funded through a councillor's LDR, I'm just wondering if then, it becomes kind of what the…our Finance people look at, in terms of getting funding for that, right, rather than looking at our whole, like, list of projects that we might be having throughout the whole city. So I'm just wondering if it's…because it's in the budget books, and it's a placeholder through like councillors' funding. Would it then be, put it on a higher priority for this level of funding?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I don't believe we typically use Canada Community-Building Fund money for projects that are funded through Land Dedication Funds. I can double and triple check that. There's a particular project that she has that she'd like…she mentioned something in Charleswood and we can investigate further for you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move to the next committee. It's the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Rollins, Chair.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED DECEMBER 2, 2024

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wish to move consent agenda Items one through…sorry, I'm missing it.

Madam Speaker: One through three?

Councillor Rollins: One through three, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: I will be recusing myself on Item two for a perceived apprehension of bias.

Madam Speaker: Certainly. We will vote on that first if you want to leave the chamber, Councillor Chambers. Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: So moved Item No. two, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay.Madam Clerk, the item is?

Item 2 – Extension of Time – Subdivision and Rezoning – 180 Creek Bend Road – DASZ 12/2021

Madam Speaker: Madam Chair, you've introduced?

Councillor Rollins: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Call the vote.

Councillor Rollins: Yes.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Then we'll come back to Item one.

Councillor Rollins: One and three, Madam Speaker, so moved.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any of them being stood down? No? I'll call the question on Item one and three. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 140/2024 be read first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 140/2024.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins.

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

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I move that By-law No. 7/2023, By-law No. 66/2024, By-law No. 106/2024, By-law No. 121/2024, By-law No. 125/2024.

Madam Speaker: That is for second reading. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 7/2023, By-law No. 66/2024, By-law No. 106/2024, By-law No. 121/2024, By-law No. 125/2024.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I move that the following by-laws be read a first…sorry, a third time: By-law 7/2023, By-law 66/2024, By-law 106/2024, By-law 121/2024 and 125/2024, like I said, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed, Madam Speaker. So moved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

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

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I move that the following by-laws be read a first time. Oh, sorry.

Madam Speaker: That's correct.

Councillor Rollins: Be read a first time: By-law No. 139/2024, By-law No. 141/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 139/2024, By-law No. 141/2024.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I move that By-law Nos. 139/2024 and 141/2024 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 139/2024 and 141/2024.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rules be suspended and By-law Nos. 139/2024 and 141/2024 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 under this committee. Any questions? Next is Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste and the Environment. Councillor Duncan, our chair, on the report dated November 22nd.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT DATED NOVEMBER 22, 2024

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce report of November 22nd and move consent agenda Items one through…and three.

Madam Speaker: Three has been pulled. Three is Progress Towards a Geothermal Utility. I'll call the question on one and two. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 3 – Progress Towards a Geothermal Utility

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan, to introduce the report.

Councillor Duncan: Yeah, I'll wait to hear from my Council colleague.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillors Duncan and Dobson who voted for this somewhat impromptu motion that came up at the committee. Nothing much controversial here, I don't think. This is not to be confused, though, and perhaps conspicuous by his absence is another motion that had come up from the Climate Action Committee that was defeated at Water and Waste which talked about, in broad terms, doing a study of moving away from natural gas for heating of buildings. And that's fine. There was a good debate. There were a lot of delegations. Good speeches by all three of us, perhaps, probably. Hopefully mine would fit that bill. But all three of us spoke in some detail to it and the reasons to vote for and against that. And it was defeated. But two things: the Manitoba government issued in September an Affordable Energy Plan that talks about moving away from non-renewable heating sources such as natural gas. So, I do think we should get their position on geothermal utility. That was something in broad strokes that was discussed in the NDP election manifesto was how to move forward on geothermal. We have talked here about moving forward and hopefully we will in this Council about getting the renewed natural gas thing up and running at Brady. That has taken years and is…I had asked the Mayor about that at the last Council and hopefully we will see progress very soon on that. But frankly, what I…so, first point is, let's pass this today. I would encourage…I'd see what the Province is thinking of in terms of geothermal, because it's not just all electric to replace natural gas. It could be geothermal. Could be renewed natural gas like what we're doing at Brady. But more than that, before the next budget, it would be useful for all of us to sit down in a room somewhere and talk about what we might want to see in the budget. The green utility that the Mayor had in his platform has not progressed. The staff are not…

Madam Speaker: Question, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: That is not a question, though. I can speak.

Madam Speaker: Yes, we are not there yet. Go ahead.

Councillor Mayes: The staff, I don't know that any external funders were supportive of that, but we could at least do something on retrofitting buildings. There's some sort of report coming back about that. The frustration…and the mounting frustration is, we have some grandiose climate action plans. We have a rather grandiose energy road map. We do very little toward that. There actually was mention of it under the infrastructure fund earlier today. To Mr. Mahé's credit, I suspect he wrote that in about the community energy road map. Perhaps to Councillor Rollins, to her credit, thank you. I think it would be helpful if instead of passing another climate action plan with even more ambitious targets of being net zero by 2045 instead of 2050 if we actually did something towards meeting the targets. Instead of setting ever more ambitious targets, perhaps put some money in, do something that would actually have environmental impact. So, the vote was what it was on the natural gas motion. That is fine. My colleagues had some good reasons for their votes. But and this is noncontroversial, but it does give it a chance to discuss, look, if we're going to have these climate action plans and energy investment road maps, we should probably be doing something toward them. We have full-time staff on these things. Let's try and put some money toward it. I think the way you land on that is some sort of energy efficient retrofits to our buildings. Obviously, too late for this budget, but for the next budget cycle, maybe the 16 of us could sit in a room and try and come

up with something that would be environmentally friendly and economically friendly for our budget. God knows we will save money on carbon tax if we do that, as well as energy cost. So, for today, thank you to Councillor Duncan, Councillor Dobson for voting for this motion. I hope we all do. And for the medium term, let's before budget '26, try and land on something that retrofits some buildings.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: You know, couldn't be more right. I think it's really important, Madam Speaker, that we do work with the Province of Manitoba. Not too long ago, I had a, you know…you know, former MP, Judy Wasylycia-Leis, who is working on…yeah, come to me, talk about housing. Why? Because a co-op is interested in geothermal and interested in net zero. And so am I, Madam Speaker, which is why I am really happy we passed that the proposal selection for the (inaudible). To Councillor Mayes' point, I had tried, Madam Speaker, to…just to send him a little note saying, you know, this is written for you, I think. To ensure that we are looking at projects using the low carbon and net zero housing construction in line with the Canadian…our on CEIR road map. What is critical, though, is that these new technologies are supported by hydro. So, I don't see how we can't do this without Province. We have done some really significant partnering with them. I think that that is great. We know that they're…they are funding projects. That is great. But to get ground source geothermal infrastructure to provide those carbon free year-round options on a neighbourhood level we need a bit more work. So, as chair of housing and chair of Property and Development, it is on my list when I meet with ministers to work for change and to make sure that we have a utility that has some way of managing the requests and the demands that I think are out there. We know we have the best green building sector in Manitoba. So, I think we can do this. We just…you know, it's going to take more work. And we do have some really good roots started thanks to Councillor Mayes and others and continuing on with Councillor Duncan to work this file in a stronger way.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: I won't say too much other than to say I'm rather pleased to see rather slow but sure evolution on geothermal. Happens to be, that as the world goes, the province of Manitoba at one point was one of the leaders as some sort of semi…semi sovereign entity in the world. I just remember as a child before it became that leader, just as a child, learning about the possibilities of this and being told this is very real. And if we keep working at it, it's going to happen. We kept working at it and it's slowly but surely happening. Long time coming including in terms of the involvement here of…here at the City of Winnipeg and city hall. Once again, I do want to thank Brian Mayes for heeding my words, pretty much as the way he put it, in terms of applying this to the city's plans for buildings. And I am glad to see that the evolution continues. It has been the case, as I just said, statistically check it out because there are some people who have been monitoring this for decades. That we have been a…we've been a leader and hopefully we can again. We've got lots of reasons to be so. I understand there's, you know, not that many places in the world that have the same amount of real practical energy as Canada…as Canada does, with the different forms of fossil fuels, which we really should cherish because they are so valuable. They are so potent. They are amazing. And we should prolong them as long as we can. We are one of the few countries in the world that has an overabundance…some sort of overabundance of hydroelectricity. And yet, the simple ability to export hydroelectric…electricity might…we can't prove it is going to last forever. We…I even see environmentalists for the first time in my life this year, 2014 was an eye-opener for me. People that are environmentally inclined accepting to some degree nuclear energy as a legitimate potential for the future to save our economy, (inaudible) our society. And I am kind of surprised. I've got to say it I have been talking about it with people and they are surprised, too. But it's part of that reasonability that we might have to go to. Now, that sounds funny coming from a…it sounds unusual from a Manitoban because we're used to the hydroelectric power. But let's face it, how many provinces in Canada do have nuclear power? Is it just Ontario? Doesn't…Quebec doesn't need it, that's for sure. I think it's just Ontario. Having said that, Ontario, you know, 40 percent of Canada by population. 40 percent, not 30 percent. You know, so a great proportion of Canadians live in a province that has nuclear power. We have…so it's…that is the reality for Canada. But we should not…we just shouldn't waste the opportunities, especially in a place like Canada. If we can't do geothermal, not…then other places can't either. But we can. We have proven that in Manitoba for decades. And I think we owe it to ourselves to continue on in terms of looking at viable energy options. It happens to be that we have to deal with to some extent here in Canada that wind energy might…is increasing its viability. We have to contend and be honest with each other, straight up with each other, because we are talking about something really important – energy to sustain our economy. And you don't want to really…you want to put rose-coloured glasses on this stuff when you're talking about energy sources. It's not helpful. It doesn't help anybody. Because sooner or later, you pay the piper. And so, we have to come to some realizations in terms of the inherent limitations of solar energy. You know, I am not saying it has no uses or it's useless, I'm just saying it has specific limitations here that other places don't have. It means more to them. Let's face it, to give you an example, in certain place in the world, they can grow their gasoline on a basis that is economically viable. When we create ethanol for motors in Canada, you know, the return on investment is almost minimal. So, although we are capable of doing it without lose, there's no return on the investment. In other words, if we wanted to use that same land for growing wheat or whatever, but we're using it, you know, to put into ethanol. You know, or 10…or you see 10 percent ethanol in the gasoline. One can make the…one could make the argument that you are wasting that land that

could be doing something else, like making food for people and helping reduce the cost of…cost of food. I am not saying that is the reason for why the cost of food is going up. I'm just saying, when we look to the future…and that is what energy is about, looking to the future. Certain things have greater viability and one of those is geothermal. And watch for the evolution because there will be some greater evolution in it to some extent as well as it is a certain function of the technologies applied. Having said that, I find it interesting, just as a side note, maybe I should have said this earlier to bury it, that when it comes to Councillor Brian Mayes talking about the NDP's manifesto. I don't recall him saying when Brian Pallister came in that he came in with a manifesto. I just find that ironic, that's all, and rather amusing. But having said that, cheers to Councillor Mayes. Cheers to Councillor Duncan. Cheers to all of us who are helping to evolve the practical sources of energy that are better sort of obligatory, like, necessary for us. Because we have to…we have to accept the certain limitations of other…of other energy sources. And geothermal can be a really, really practical one. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Oh boy, Councillor Schreyer got me going. I'm going to keep this brief. I'll try. So, Madam Speaker, through you to Council, I think I want to declare myself energy agnostic in terms of which technologies I support or not. But if you look at…I like data driven analysis. And I recommend, yet again, an author who lives in St. Vital Ward, Councillor Mayes, world famous in the top 100…I forget all of his credentials. Professor Emeritus, University of Manitoba. I'm not sure…Bill Gates named him as his favour author. Looks forward to his books like the next 'Star Wars' movie, apparently. What triggered me with Councillor Schreyer's presentation is what he was saying about using ethanol for…to replace fossil fuels. And there is a chart in that…in a book called 'Energy and Civilization', which brings you from basically prehistory to today, and our use of energy. And on biofuels, if I recall correctly, the absorption rate of sun energy of plants is like something like a one percent for phytomass. It's called phytomass when you're using plants for fuel. It's really very inefficient way of capturing sun energy relative to solar, 60 to 80 percent efficiency. Wind is efficient as well. (inaudible) talks about the major problem with green energy being…green or renewable energy being the storage of said energy. So, storage could be through the form of heat, it could be through the form of hydrogen. Like, we're talking about hydrogen with our bus fleets. And at the end of the day, what's…at the end of the day, it's all energy from the sun. With fossil fuels, it's energy from the sun that we're pulling out of the ground that's been there for a very, very long time as opposed to solar panels which is taking sun energy today and capturing 60 to 80 percent. But on biofuels, from what I have read, relative to other technologies, it is…it's not a…it's not a very efficient if you are going to take it to replace agricultural lands. I guess I will echo some of Councillor Mayes' comments on I prefer…I hope that we can find some strategic actions to…as a municipality do more on climate change. I heard my…one of my colleagues earlier speaking to the media about how this budget means net new buses because we are taking a direction of honouring our ISIP agreement on zero emission buses. But after that transitioning to buying more diesel buses which if I understand correctly, means the same budget, more net new buses. Councillor Lukes, am I right? Yes. 19 net new buses. So, the greenhouse gas emissions for buses, according to our latest report, which is geothermal is great. But once again, I think that the technology is less important and the numbers are more important. So, geothermal performs well. The capital…the capital investment upfront is high. The return is very good. And there are geothermal, like, heat exchangers now that work until minus 10 Celsius at capital investment…the capital investment is low upfront. It's not as good as geothermal but it's better than using resistance heating…resistance electric heating. That to say, that I think we have some opportunities in the city of Winnipeg, strategic opportunities like counterintuitively changing from zero emission buses to diesel buses will be…will mean a net reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in Winnipeg because we know that for our entire transit fleet, less than one percent of greenhouse gas emissions is responsible. Our transit fleet is responsible for less than one percent of our greenhouse gas emissions, whereas private vehicle travel is 30 percent for residential, 20 percent for commercial. So, it's an order of magnitude. One zero chopped off in terms of how much greenhouse gas emissions our transit system is responsible for. So, 20 buses is not going to have a material impact to our greenhouse gas emissions relative to the amount of private vehicle travel we have. So, to me it's clear as day that transit is the way to, well, to achieve our greenhouse gas emission goals. More transit means less greenhouse gas emitted as long as we offer a system that Winnipeggers are going to use and there's a reduction in private vehicle travel. And that even if we do use diesel instead of zero emission buses. So, I think…I think we tend to get focused on the technologies. I am also…I have also done that, fixated on specific technologies, but I think you need to look at the numbers. And sometimes you have surprising counterintuitive results like buying diesel buses for transit is better for…better for the greenhouse gas portfolio of Winnipeg because if you were to buy the same…if you were to use the same amount of money to buy less buses that are zero emission and those buses are on the road less time and you need more infrastructure upfront in order for those buses to run, then you are running less buses and the transit offering is less good than it could be. All other things being equal. So, thank you, Councillor Schreyer, for inspiring me to speak. You sparked in me a desire to, I guess, share that I think we need to look at the numbers. And I think we do. Hidden in…hidden in the policies of Council whether it is infilling houses, whether it's building new housing that have better energy efficiency, whether it's increasing our transit fleets, whether it's installing new car shares, whether it's increasing the carbon capture and all the associated kind of benefits of having a better tree canopy. We are doing things that do benefit the environment and reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. I am skeptical that we are on track to meet our objectives or what do we call them, Councillor Mayes? The big documents that have big goals? What is it? Aspirational. We have many documents that have many aspirational goals. And many of them have goals that I do not

believe will be achieved in our lifetimes if not ever. But I do know that we were doing some things at the strategic level like buying 20 net new buses in the six-year capital forecast because a decision to…because a decision to transition to diesel. And those are good for a reduction in the environment. So, I think what is missing here is probably information because the numbers I am using are quite old at this point. And I did use my 10 minutes. I kept it to 10. No, no, no. No extension.

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

Councillor Duncan: Yes, thank you very much. And you know, unfortunately, around this council table, it appears as though we are getting a little lost in what this is. That the Province of Manitoba be requested to provide a report to the City of Winnipeg on the progress towards a geothermal utility. So, just so the public doesn't confused again, Madam Speaker, because unfortunately, they did come to committee and thought that we were going to be turning off the natural gas tomorrow. That is not the case, nor it is the case with this recommendation that came from Water, Waste and Environment SPC. Grandiose is a great word that Councillor Mayes used there. Let's maybe not focus so much on grandiose and focus on exactly it is that our role is here with the City of Winnipeg. Asking for a report from the Province on this work seems to be in line with that. But you know, I just want to make sure that we are and I've used this term before, laser focused. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Duncan for refocusing us. With that, I will call the question on Item three. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now go into question period. Any questions for our Chair? Seeing none, next is the Governance Committee of Council. Asking for an extension of time for up to 60 days. Councillor Eadie, will you move that on my behalf?

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL DATED DECEMBER 3, 2024

Councillor Eadie: I will move report number one on your behalf, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: We're ready to bring that forward in 60 days. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have the report on a complaint by City of Winnipeg Integrity Commissioner. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT ON COMPLAINT BY CITY OF WINNIPEG INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I would like to move layover of this matter until our January meeting, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I agree with that. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Councillor Chambers moves adjournment. Please stay for roll call. Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk, roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 3:09 p.m.