COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, July 18, 2024

The Council met at 9:43 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.

MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: I'd like to begin the meeting by welcoming our Chief Administrative Officer, Sherwood Armbruster, who's joining Council today for the first time in his new role. Congratulations. We have a motion that's been circulated, to allow Mayor Gillingham to participate remotely for today's meeting, moved by myself and Councillor Lukes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mayor's been away on City business and therefore, is participating remotely today.

Moved by Councillor Sharma,
Seconded by Councillor Lukes,

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

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Lukes.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Madam Acting Deputy Mayor, Acting Mayor. Roll call, Madam Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. It is my pleasure to introduce our pages for today's meeting. They've been here before, joining us once again today, Saylem Meleck from Dakota Collegiate, who resides in Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry Ward, and Taylor Moore from Collège Pierre-Elliott-Trudeau who resides in the Transcona Ward. Thank you for being here today. We'll now move on to morning announcements. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor from New York.

Mayor Gillingham: Good morning, Madam Speaker. Can you hear me okay?

Madam Speaker: Yes, we can.

Mayor Gillingham: Okay. Good morning, everyone. Thank you. Yes, I'm here in New York remotely, Zooming in today. I've been attending the Bloomberg Harvard Initiative. City's initiative which is the school for Mayors for the past four days. I was supposed to be on a flight home last night in time for Council, but all the flights got cancelled because of weather. So, here we are today. So, thank you to everybody for granting me the opportunity to be part of the meeting today remotely and thank you for also to our staff who make all this happen, and so I appreciate it. The Bloomberg Harvard Initiative is an excellent initiative; it's funded entirely out of Bloomberg Philanthropies. So, there's no cost to the City of Winnipeg. And I'm honoured to join one of 39 Mayors from all around the world for this initiative, which goes the entire year long. Former Mayor Brian Bowman was part of this initiative, and it's an excellent opportunity. The bottom line is we are going to get as a City to work on one project through the coming year together. And I've chosen of all the projects we could choose, I've chosen to work on vacant derelict buildings, which I know is important for all of us to see, Madam Speaker, to see the number of vacant and derelict buildings, not only reduced but those properties redeveloped for housing and commercial

use. So more to come in the coming...in the coming year. Just simply to say it's a combination; the Bloomberg Harvard Initiative is a partnership between Bloomberg... Michael Bloomberg Philanthropies. Michael Bloomberg, of course, was the Mayor of New York City for 12 years and Harvard University. So, we really benefited as Mayors over the last four days from the teaching of Harvard professors, from this Harvard School of Business and the Kennedy School of Public Policy. So, it's very, very enriching. And as I said, the work will continue on for the next year. I do also want to just thank and congratulate everybody involved in the 49th annual Folk Fest. Folk Fest just wrapped up recently. Next year, they're looking at their 50th anniversary. It was great celebration with great attendance. And again, it takes a lot of people to organize that event. Congratulations to everybody who's involved in that. I got to go to opening night. It was just... it was really great to see everybody out enjoying the Birds Hill Park and the music that Folk Fest provides. Two final things, also just to acknowledge that Fringe Fest, started just recently. It goes till July the 28th. If you have an opportunity to get down and enjoy the Fringe, then please, please do so. Thank you. Shout out to all the volunteers who make Fringe Fest possible. And also, just to acknowledge that we're still celebrating our Winnipeg 150 all throughout the year. We had a great event, a sister cities event recently at The Forks and all of our 11 sister cities were involved in that day, and really well attended. And it was just an excellent...an excellent day of celebrating our relationship with our sister cities. We have the Mayor's Ball coming up on October 5th. All the proceeds of that ball will be going to our four performing arts groups. Just so everybody knows I have worked with our Integrity Commissioner because we do have the rules around raising funds, but we worked with our Integrity Commissioner to ensure that everything we do is by the book. And so that for sure is being done. My final comment is to everybody who will be taking a bit of a holiday break sometime in the next several weeks. I wish you a good time of refreshing and renewal and thank everybody for all the hard work that they do. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I just wanted to get up...actually and wish everyone a great break over the summer and speak to some of the 150 events that are coming up, and to really highlight Folklorama. We are a city of multiculturalism and diversity. And I know we all have the opportunity to go to multi…to go to Folklorama and I'll be going up in full force, I hope to see many of you at the pavilions to encourage and support our communities. So, I just wanted to also add on Folklorama and the celebrations that will be occurring with Folklorama.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes.

MINUTES

Councillor Gilroy moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on June 27, 2024 be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We'll now move into delegations. I'd like to call forward Christopher Clacio, who is joining us in person in support of item two of report of Executive Policy Committee dated July 9, 2024. It's regarding the analysis of costs associated with the adoption of a living wage. Welcome, Chris.

Christopher Clacio: Good morning, City Council. I hope your Council meeting today is short concerning it's your last one before your month-long August summer break. Hope you and your families have a wonderful summer. Just a quick introduction of who I am again. My name is Chris Clacio. Reminder, I am a civic practitioner and a policy entrepreneur, I am also the lead community engagement officer of block chain Manitoba, which is a brand-new nonprofit. Our mission is to advance opportunities for creators and entrepreneurs about block chain technologies. To his worship, I know you're speaking with a lot of Mayors around the world. And so, I would suggest also talking about block chain technology. This is revolutionizing how we address housing. I am here today to speak on item 2. Analysis of costs associated with adoption of a living wage. On July 9th of the Executive Policy Committee, I spoke to this item as well, sharing three points of importance that I think EPC should be keeping in mind related to policy outcomes of a living wage within society. Today I would like to expand on those points. Point one: the idea of work is changing because of technologies like artificial intelligence, automation and block chain technology. Not only technology but also related work force demographics. We have more millennials now in the Canadian work force than any other generation. One in three working age persons from 15 to 64 are millennials. From Statistics Canada census of population in 2021: 33.2 percent are millennials, 29.5 are generation X, baby boomers are 19.7, and generation Z is 17.6. Why is this important? At the last June 27 Council meeting,

I shared as a policy entrepreneur that I believe that perceptions shapes policy, and policy sets priorities. And priorities are all about process. Let me add one thing to that statement: lived experiences informs perceptions that shapes policy. I was born in 1992, which puts me in the category of a millennial. Point 2: many councillors I know would say let the unions and the collective bargaining agreement be the appropriate process of how the City would implement a living wage. To this point let me share my own lived experiences related to my current day job, which is paying me a living wage of 21.05 dollars per hour. My union is UFCW local 832. I work at the Real Canadian Superstore and am currently told that our newest CDA is the best contract that my workplace has ever received in 25 years. My rent for where I live jumped from 979 dollars to 1,018 dollars a month. I also get a rent assistance amount from the province of 17 dollars a month. The total income I make a year is 32,000 dollars. But the average total income within our region is 59,000 dollars. If you are using the CCPA data set as example, you can consider what I am making at workplace 21 dollars an hour a living wage. Let me say that I am still struggling to maintain a good standard of living and quality of life within my current wages and tax bracket. In the past, I have had to take on three jobs just to make a proper living. One more thing I keep hearing is, millennials are not as wealthy as other generations before. The idea of home ownership is tougher, and I keep hearing about the migration of young people leaving our city and province. And point 3: everyone in city hall has heard Councillor Jason Schreyer speak about construction inflation being one of the biggest costs related to City finances. I know in the field of economics. Economists would call that an externality. Construction inflation is an external factor outside this local City government. Which is why I believe city hall does not take that point you make all of the time in Council as serious as you do, Councillor Schreyer. I would like to say on the record, to Councillor Schreyer, through you, Madam Speaker, that I 100 percent agree that you take very seriously at your word that the city hall really needs to look at the construction inflation at a serious level within the capital costs that the City pays for through debt in the long-term. Again, which is why I encourage this city hall when you do hire your Chief Construction Officer, I do hope that they have the qualifications related to economics, technology, innovation, and data, and a financial background. Who is an expert in supply chain management and in both public and private procurement processes. This will address the inefficiencies and exponential costs within City processes, decision making outcomes and results and policy implementation. Why is this my third point related to living wage, you ask? It is because back when I first heard about talks of implementing a living wage within city hall, back in 2021, I remember that the talks that city hall should also include a living wage be within city contracts related to capital and infrastructure projects. With that, I end my speech. And I want to say to Council is, thank you for your service, and that after we come back in September, I will be sending all councillors an e-mail about a sit down over coffee so we can talk more about some of my ideas. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Chris. If you could just stand down on the bench, and we will hear from the next delegation, and then move on to questions. Mr. Gord Delbridge is from CUPE local 500. Gord is joining us in person here today on the same report. And also, on the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and Environment dated June 28, 2024. It's regarding the consolidation of garbage collection operations review; it's item number 4. Welcome.

Gord Delbridge: Thank you. And I would also like to recognize that you've got some time off coming up, this is the last Council meeting. I wish all of you a much-deserved summer break. I would like to talk first about living wage and then I will get into garbage and recycling. I've been here many times talking about this issue. But the one thing this does for me, though, is it gives me the opportunity to rebut some mistruths, some misconceptions that often are coming up left, right and centres. To the point where sometimes it is somewhat disturbing. And so, I will just go through a lot of those mistruths and comments that are being made, that we are hearing in the media, hearing by many individuals. First off what do we, what do we know here? We know that this was passed in OurWinnipeg2045 document. This was passed by third reading unanimously in 2020. All of you voted in favor of the OurWinnipeg document, which included a living wage. I think it is important to look for taxpayers and Winnipeggers when you pass a motion, you support an initiative, that you stand behind it, that it shows credibility. Myself, I always tell people, my word you can count on. My handshake you can count on. It's as good as my signature, so if I vote on something, I am going to stand behind it. And so, I would expect that, you as elected officials would, too. It is a good document. I want to talk about the admin report that made, there was many mistruths in the admin report. And, I just want to clarify that, I am not blaming administration for this report. I understand that they did this report as they were directed to do. But in the report, it was very misleading. There was claims that this was going to cost taxpayers 3 million dollars and all of these additional costs, that there was going to be compression and compounding impacts all the way down the road, that it was going to cost millions and millions of dollars. All unfounded, untrue. As a matter of fact, the actual cost reviews, independent economists and people that use formulas and calculations that are consistent with other regions that have adopted a living wage, the actual cost is going to cost about 300,000 dollars for city employees. There are many factors that were not accounted for. It didn't account...when we sat down with administration, we had to go through and let them know that they weren't including the negotiated wages, they were costing advances. We negotiated a special wage adjustment. They were costing advances; this wasn't being included. At every turn they did at some point use some of our formulation. We still think it is much closer to being accurate. It's not the 3 million that's been reported in the media, they found it to be around 500,000. But once again, they didn't include the 1-million-dollar special wage adjustment that has been already budgeted for, that has been negotiated, that is going to end up being allocated to many of the lower paid classifications. So, they said 500,000, didn't include this money. You can do the math yourself. What are we looking at? That's why our figure is coming closer to 300,000. This is really pennies

when you look at the overall budget. Then there is misconception that we are negotiating wages here. No, we are not negotiating wages here. We are asking for them to implement the policy you already voted on. It's not negotiating, we are not negotiating what a living wage is. We don't control the economy. We don't get to negotiate what a living wage is. Living wage is set. It's set and it's determined by accredited economists that are using a formula that is used by many other municipalities right across the country. We are not coming up with these figures, we are not negotiating these figures. Once again, we are just asking you to implement the policy. And as a matter of fact when it comes to saying that we don't bargain, and we shouldn't be negotiating wages outside of bargaining, I want to add we just ratified an agreement for the community safety officers last week. So, we are proud that we got that done. And we did that outside of bargaining. And I think that it is a good initiative. We stand behind it, we support it. And we think it is going to be successful. And it is important that we are always willing to sit down and discuss at any given time. Either party can agree to discuss and negotiate as we just have done here in this case that I've referenced. So, what do we do know? We do know that there was a research poll done on whether or not Winnipeggers support the City of Winnipeg becoming a living wage employer. 81 percent of Winnipeggers in 2018 supported the City of Winnipeg becoming a living wage employer. This was in 2018. Times are economically harder now than they were in 2018. I suspect that 81 percent support would be higher now than it would be then. With the support that you listen to people that elected you. And keep in mind that 81 percent of the people support this. Keep in mind that all of Council supported this, back in 2020 unanimously. So, we are using actual numbers here. We are accounting for benefits; we are accounting for sick days. You know, this meets the criteria. If you look across, every region is different on how they calculate what the living wage is, based on the...on each region's local economy and even employers account it differently based on the benefits and various things it offers. We took that into account. But for the City of Winnipeg it actually works out to be, with the benefits, it is 17.87 dollars an hour. This was not our figures, once again, this comes from independent economists that were commissioned to do the report, and so we shared that with the administration, and yet for some reason they didn't want to listen to what some of the economists were saying in many aspects in this report. So there is a lot of misconceptions and inconsistencies. How many living wages employers are there across Canada? There are thousands of living wage employers. How many Municipalities? Approximately 20 municipalities right across Canada. They are showing strong leadership. We should show some leadership here, too. Let's improve Winnipeg, let's make Winnipeg the place that we all want it to be. This will be a step in the right direction. How many employers are there in Winnipeg? There is many employers here. The Assiniboine Credit Union, the Persons Community Solutions, West Central Winnipeg Women's Resource Centre are all living wage employers. They're showing strong leadership. They want to be an employer of choice as we should seeking to do as well. What else would this do? Implementing a living wage would improve services for Winnipeggers. There would be less staff turnover. That would save us money. That should be factored in. Wouldn't have to train as many people. People want to see services improving. And we don't want to have turnover, so that we are constantly having to train. Because that's currently what's taking place right now. I actually see this as not even costing Winnipeggers at all. Actually, I see this as an investment, which is going to have net positive gains in the long run. Because we are going to have less turnover of staff, we are going to be doing less training, we are going to have improved quality of services, we are going to be able to operate more efficiently. The list goes on and on and on. It is a smart move. That is why other municipalities are doing it, that's why other employers are doing it. Especially during the times now with tough economic times and challenging labor market this is the most important time to be looking at a policy that was brought forward by Council and initiating it. The other thing that I think this would do, this would improve gender wage parity, would support equity-seeking members that make up a large demographic of these low-income earners. It's about 5 percent of City staff that would be deemed not to be making a living wage. So, I strongly encourage you all to support this. I hope somebody asks for a recorded vote. I think this is very important. And I think it is important that Winnipeggers know who supports working-class Winnipeggers and who doesn't.

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

Gord Delbridge: I will be really quick here on garbage collection. Once again, we've got a report that doesn't encompass all the costs. We know we are seeing contract extension fees increasing in amounts 60 percent plus. We've got legal challenges right now with former garbage collection contractors, whose really tarnished our image. If we look at some of the past garbage contractors that we've been working with, we've seen many Municipalities right across the country that are bringing an in-house model for some checks and balances to ensure that we are not running these crazy contract extension fees. When we are spending taxpayers' money, it is important to be diligent, it's important to look at all aspects. If you're bringing one component in house, this is doing the right thing, this is being transparent to the taxpayers and the citizens of Winnipeg. This would give us a lot more flexibility, you'd have the right to manage, the employer has the right to manage, as opposed to your own work force. When you contract out the work, that's not your work force, you do not manage them. So, you do have much more flexibility in the operations, and I think that… that is needed, especially in the areas that we proposed for the in-house garbage collection. And it is important to look at this and not once again, kick the can down the road. We have got to take some accountability and do what is right there. So, I ask everyone to support this motion as well. I will take any questions if anyone has them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Chris, I will call you back as well. Any questions for our delegation? Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Schreyer

Councillor Mayes: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Delbridge. You told me a story once about, I am not sure if it was your father or a father of someone you knew, that worked for the city, and made a career out of garbage collection, had a pension, raised their family. Can you relate that story?

Gord Delbridge: Actually, it is a neighbour that actually lives down the Street from me. He is retired now. He raised two boys. Owns his house. Pays his taxes. He is a productive member of society. He was a garbage collector for the City of Winnipeg for his entire career. At some point in time, they decided to go to a different model, picking up day workers, often probably many living in homeless camps along the river. And so, we don't ever factor in what those costs are. I mean, is that the kind of thing we want to promote? I think we should be promoting my neighbour down the street that was able to retire, own a home, pay his taxes, and become productive member of our society. It is not cheaper. I mean, there are accountants telling you this is cheaper. It is not cheaper. It is costing us, in other aspects, and I think that we need to look at all aspects when you are spending taxpayers' dollars.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In this case and I thank both our speakers. Mr. Delbridge too, I am going to ask a question to Chris Clacio, related to actually what he said and what Gord Delbridge said. Chris Clacio was talking about how construction inflation costs at city hall are considered externalities and not within the bounds of our purview for consideration. It is something we should be fatalistic about and not take any responsibility for when it comes to accounting for the taxpayer and for the budget. Gord Delbridge made the point on, when it comes to living wages based on the cost of living, that we don't consider the cost of living. It is like externality. Chris Clacio talked about the externality when it comes to construction inflation. We don't take any responsibility for it. What would Chris have to say about whether we recognize living wages as externalities or the costs of living pressures on this? It looks like we are trying to say it doesn't matter what the cost of living is, we can impose any wages we want, which is, I guess, what we can do. Through a function of negotiation in many of the cases. But we are ignoring the fact that cost of living is real, kind of thing. Do you have any comment to say about that? I just notice that the two of you have some sort of harmonious concepts that I think we should be thinking about at city hall. Somehow, some things are external. We shouldn't be thinking about them, even though they affect the budget, when it comes to construction costs. How about when it comes to living wages, we can just magically decide what is and what isn't a livable wage even with externalities there, like consumer inflation.

Christopher Clacio: So, first off, I just want to say, coming from my perspective, I am coming through this perspective of looking through a living wage through a worker's eyes. I am also… My union UFCW is one of the largest international public sector unions in the world. CUPE, I'm told, is the biggest public sector union in Manitoba. And I think, what connects CUPE's work in our city hall is addressing city processes, especially through the collective bargaining agreements. That is the best way unions in the public sector and private sector can unite is talking about processes. One of the things that I truly believe, that the City should really address, is talking about procurement processes. Within the procurement processes, there is the bid process, the tendering process, the awarding process, there's also writing the agreements. Within those agreements, that is where you address these externalities related to inflation, related to the economic system that we live in. I think that is my main analysis of how I see a living wage and how City processes do determine what kind of outcomes the City wants. And we know that the City wants to keep young people in the city. And we don't want to see young people like myself leaving the city, Because I think there is so much fundamentally, it's so powerful living in this city specifically. And I think we need to acknowledge that Winnipeg could be a world leader across the world. And I think, looking through this with the worker's eyes is a key part of understanding why construction inflation is important.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, that concludes our question period. Thank you for your presentations, gentlemen. Next, we have David Grant, who is appearing remotely on a number of items as listed on the delegation page. David, welcome.

David Grant: Thank you. I will try to be as brief as I can, on these topics. On EPC number two, it's a hot topic, We've just had some discussion of it. Decades ago, when I cleaned parks and cut city grass for a living, I lived on my own. I had no relatives within 100 miles. So, I was forced to be on my own. I could not afford rent. I found a room that cost very little. I also worked on getting a better City job, as it turns out, in a sewage treatment plant, and I could soon afford a rent a house. Getting a better job, living a frugal life and sharing apartments with others are options for most city workers. I would suggest we do not upset the City's procurement and pay systems as it has been explained by others. On EPC number five, it may be fun to attend meetings in person. And I certainly enjoy being at city hall rather than on Zoom, but the greenhouse gas cost to travel to a meeting is always higher than for e-attendance. And I suggest that, you not forbid this option. On EPC number ten, I favor stuff like this that reduce fuel wasting traffic congestion. The City must have standards for adding lanes and signal functions, so they are not added capriciously, as it seems to happen with 4-way stops. I face other intersections that now waste time because traffic patterns have evolved a lot. At least ask city staff to write the cost-benefit inflation policies that will be used every time that intersection improvements are needed in the future. On EPC 13, I cannot believe the developments, they shouldn't be allowed without traffic studies. I must thank Nick, the earlier

(inaudible) comments, for raising the initiative of the changes forced on the folks in North Roberts. For many years that (inaudible) that represent my relatives that lived in North Roberts, as massive infills was forced upon them. One of the most important functions of City Hall is to prevent disasters. Changes that result in traffic congestion should be known before hand and mitigated. This change in policy will ruin the quality of life for residents as if it turns into a traffic issue. Just because our left coast has forbidden single family houses and has abandoned the interest of local communities does not justify our Council doing the same to us. So, I am hoping that we will take these communities...our communities into consideration. EPC 14, as City Hall struggles to fund basic operations, making changes to increase non-basic spending is clearly contraindicated. The privately owned arts and social services companies should understand that spending on their staff and operations are not core City functions in the way that auto repair is. You can send them this important message: we are not extending your application window. Well, you message them this way. On the Water topic five, green carts. I've spent my whole life composting, I think I have explained that here for a decade, I've spent my whole life composting and helping others to do so. There are huge problems with the City's proposed program. The City has failed to explore the costs and the benefits of the program. We've been asked to accept some of this, as if they were solid, economic and scientific facts. This fact should trouble each you. That the results of the trial that we tried out, that we paid for a while back. They are considered the private property of the company, which is hired to study the residential food waste collection. Did they discover some kind of a way to control the stink? Unlikely? Are they covering up what they did and what they can't do? We don't know. Why the secrecy. It is a well proven fact that organic waste stinks and makes methane as it rots. Whether that happens over the summer in my yard, over the years buried in Brady, or in the city compost facility. Let's not pretend that an RFW program will not produce CH4 or stink. On Public Works topic one, as the leader of my local resident's association, I must stress that we face far worse conditions than the folks who are helping out with the new sidewalk piles. Why do you ignore those whose only way to get out of the community is to walk hundreds of meters on a rotted, icy, (inaudible) road because there is no sidewalk for us. Our community has been raising this issue for years, why have we have been so completely ignored in policy such as the one on today's agenda? On Public Works 6, there are better solutions, solutions that do not involve fines to those who simply want to drive from one place to another. On Property 10, topic 10: The HAF housing accelerator fund will increase cost of handling residential sewage. We face far more in infrastructure capital costs than the policy 122 million that we expect from Ottawa. Please pursue cost recover for this huge new spending. And I think that we don't need to call it a tax or fee or anything. We just have to gather up enough money to make changes, the sewage infrastructure changes, and water supply and so on. We have to recover enough money and that can be done by a fee and not a tax. On Property 11. I'm pleased to see that staff needs 30 more days to get these changes made correctly, please ensure us that infrastructure costs will be covered by fees, please ensure residents that their use of the properties will not be ruined by your rushed squeeze in thousands of new families and students. Please collect actual concerns from the widest possible range of actual residents. Please do not limit inputs to those who are on first name basis with planning folks. On governance one, last topic: when considering council's ethics rules, one must realize that this process was once just to provide specific advice for members of Council. It still does that. And it's a valuable function. As this process emulates the ethics processes of other bodies it investigates and reports. As it does these things, the exemptions and (inaudible) can become problematic. This item suggests good changes to the By-law. On the other hand, it fails to make other needed changes. Since complaints are not just deterrents, but are also intended to educate, they should be investigated and reported throughout every year. Investigating a complaint that is submitted long after the alleged event can still be educational. Manitoba's Bill 36 limits the secret dismissal of complaints. It had a very high priority in cabinet. Because those secret deals do harm, and they knew the rules had to change, their rules. Any regulator professionals and any ethics process whose rules enable completely secret dismissals and have narrow reporting windows may be skating on thin ice. I am working with the minister and the staff on the next steps beyond Bill 36. For this reason, all complaints should be investigated. Redaction may be needed, because that protects the names and identification of the persons involved. But such investigation should not automatically be dismissed. The best way to this involves publishing the reasons, which Ms. Walsh already does, and investigating every complaint, which the rules currently prevent her from doing. With all due respect, may I suggest that Council not approve the current changes. They stand in stark contrast with the range of ethics rules, that the cabinet wants in place. Instead, could you ask staff and Ms. Walsh to make further changes to the ethics rules bringing them more fully into the modern context. And that concludes my words. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, David. Question, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much Mr. Grant for your presentation. Are you aware that there are pop-ups and phone call-in town halls for the transportation master plan?

David Grant: Yes, I attended the one yesterday.

Councillor Lukes: Oh, you did, okay. Perfect. Alright.

David Grant: Open discussions with the staffers there.

Councillor Lukes: Perfect, I just wanted to know if you were aware of that because of your transportation background.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our delegations for this morning. Thank you, Mr. Grant, have a great day. We will now move into the reports of Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Mayor, the report dated July 9.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED JULY 9, 2024

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would introduce the report and move adoption of agenda items one to 11. I would like to pull 12, 13, 14 and 15. And I believe, Madam Speaker, I think there is an amending motion on 16.

Madam Speaker: That's correct. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Allard, you are not pulling an item?

Councillor Allard: No

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Two, five.

Madam Speaker: Two: Analysis of costs associated with the adoption of a living wage.

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, five and six.

Madam Speaker: Five is remote participation. Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: The reports… I think all reports… they are all pulled

Madam Speaker: Six has been pulled. Okay? Good. And the noting in opposition will be done during the individual votes. I will call the question. 12 has been pulled. Okay. That has been pulled also. I will call the question now. Item one...is anyone listening to the meeting? Yes, they have been pulled. Thank you. I am going to call the question on item one, three, four, seven through ten, and 11. All in favor? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 2 - Analysis of Costs Associated with the Adoption of a 'Living Wage'

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I believe there will be a lot of comment on this, so I will wait to hear from my colleagues, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in not supporting the motion coming out of EPC. You know, what I really think that this needs to be policy directive that we as Council are taking. The costs are so minimal. It really is a shame that we are even having this debate, Madam Speaker, especially when we found out that part of the collective agreement that there is going to be a top up, so it makes it even less money than the city had originally planned. And even if we use the…which I don't know if I…because I don't agree with the totals, because we heard that they didn't take in those wage adjustments. You know, even if the amount we take it at face value before those wage adjustments, Madam Speaker, it's not very much. We know that other cities have already implemented a fair living wage. And, quite frankly, Madam Speaker, we are struggling to maintain really good staff. And part of the reason, Madam Speaker, is because we are not paying. We have bus drivers we can't get bus drivers. They are going to places like Edmonton and other cities that paying a living wage, Madam Speaker. We are trying to get 311 operators, Madam Speaker. And these are our core operators of the City that are helping every single day Winnipeggers out, and we are not paying them a living wage. Like, I just think that this is a shameful thing that we are not even considering this when the costs are so low. And, so, Madam Speaker, I really hope that my councillor colleagues join me in supporting a fair living wage for employees and sending message to employees that we do care. And that we are going to become a city. If we want to be a viable city, where people to work and stay here. We have to make sure we are paying a living wage, Madam Speaker, and we are not. And I think that that is a big problem. We are still seeing people go outside of our city, Madam Speaker, looking for jobs. And if the City of Winnipeg can't be an employer, when the cost is so low, Madam Speaker, I really question things. So, I really

hope that my councillor colleagues join me, and I really hope that we decide as a policy directive that we care about this issue, that we care about employees and that we are going to make sure we as a city are paying a fair living wage, Madam Speaker. Thank you very much.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker, this morning is a really good morning for putting some information together and putting some thoughts together. Our first two speaker, Madam Speaker, our first two delegates, Chris Clacio made the point that the city advocates any responsibility to the taxpayer when it comes to construction costs increases, because it is an externality. And in fact, he is essentially right, we have seen both here in the Council chamber and in the Standing Committee, in the Finance Committee how it is explained. These things you can read about in the paper. They are externalities, they are not directly involved with the city budget, even though, they are highest increase on city budget of the generation. And there's no questioning that, Madam Speaker, it's not certainly city wages. Then we had Gord Delbridge make the point that we ignore the fact that when there are externalities like the increase in the cost of living, we don't accept that as an externality. Isn't it fascinating, that when it comes to the highest rate of increase on the city's budget, construction, those influences on inflation, we are not to think about, they are not for us to worry about or to account to the taxpayer. But when it comes to the increase in cost of living for making a living wage for city workers, that somehow isn't an externality, that we just have to live with, isn't it fascinating, Madam Speaker? So, well, it is a fascinating juxtaposition to hear Chris Clacio and Gord Delbridge this morning, because that's a really good point, that's how the city operates. Don't question construction inflation, that's an externality. That is the biggest increase in our taxes increase...in our taxes, in our budget. Are wages comparable? Are city wages comparable to construction inflation? Not even close. They are not comparable. I will say it again. And people can show me their stats from whatever think-tank they are getting the statistics from. That, in the last 30 years, construction inflation costs have gone up at ten times higher rate, than these wages of which we speak, the living wages. That is our City Hall. But magically, one is an externality, don't deal with it, don't talk about it. It's not really for us to report on, it's not for us to report to the taxpayer on. Because they are externalities. It's the biggest increase in our budget, but don't report to the taxpayer on it. When it comes to living wage. When it comes to the pressures on a living wage, when it comes to the increase in cost of living, we don't recognize that as a similar externality. Fascinating stuff. What is the result? An increase in every tax, fine, fee, levy and rate, a decrease in services, because we are betting that externality of construction inflation, but we don't recognize it for the workers that need to make a living wage. We don't recognize these externalities, increase in cost of living. Fascinating stuff, Madam Speaker. So, what do you get? An increase of every tax, fine, fee levy and rate, a reduction of services, and yet somehow, we try to pretend, we imply. It's been said in this chamber, it's on video, part of our Hansard. Labor costs are an impact on our budget increases. And yet, I've asked our Chair of Finance Committee Browaty if ever, in his time here, in Council, if wages have ever gone up at same rate as construction costs? He said he cannot recall. And he was right, because I cannot recall either, because it never happened. But somehow, we are stuck in this. Has it always been this way, by the way, Madam Speaker? We are stuck in the mindset That there is some things we should ignore and some things we shouldn't. But the stuff we ignore is causing the real pressures, the real inflationary pressures, and it's not these wages, It's not living wages. Why do we pretend this? Why are we here, Madam Speaker? I'm not here to pretend that living wages has caused the increases in tax, fees, levees and fines. Reduced our services, shrunk our financial reserves down to zero. That's what we did. We used to have all sorts of reserves. Ask Councillor Allard, because he was told when he got here, from Dan Vandal. That there was a time when we had all sorts of reserves, financial reserves. Well, Madam Speaker, they are kind of gone. To last thing we should do, if you want to be realistic and responsible it is try to imply it, is because of people trying to get a living wage that work for the city. Wow. It is just so wrong. It's just so wrong, it's just not true. So, Madam Speaker, I have been trying to get reports on what is causing the pressures on our budget. Why are we increasing every tax, fine, fee, levy and rate, reducing services and spending our reserves? Oh well, these are externalities. Fascinating stuff this morning, by the way. Fascinating. Because people are left with the impression that people looking for the living wage have caused this. And that is the last thing that caused it, because they have been the lowest rate of inflation on the City's budget. So, Cindy Gilroy has asked us to join with her. Councillor Gilroy I have always been there. Thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. OurWinnipeg is a very visionary guiding document and there's many, many things in OurWinnipeg we have included that we hope to strive for, that we can consider and that we can look at. So, I guess in regards to the living wage, it is interesting that we work in a very unionized environment. And many, many many things have to be negotiated. So, I guess the question is, if we can negotiate wages on the floor of Council, and we can come up with figure on the floor of Council, then I think we should be able to negotiate other things. Here's a couple challenges that I am faced with. We need to paint more lines on our Streets. We can't get an external contractor to increase the safety by painting lines on the street this year because we have to go through many, many, many negotiations with the union. It is a safety hazard not being able to paint lines on the Street, you think we would be able to supplement our services if we don't have enough equipment, our equipment breaks down that we can quickly outsource it and get someone

to come in and paint the lines, but we can't. We are in deep negotiations. For two years now, we are trying to keep our downtown clean, we are trying to keep our downtown…a lot of things positive in our downtown. We are trying to keep the sidewalks clean. At night, we are trying to get staff out to sweep the streets at night. We can't get staff to sweep the streets at night for two years we have been trying to get staff to sweep the streets at night. We don't have full compliment. I am constantly dealing with downtown biz. There's challenges in keeping the streets clean. Let's outsource it. We can't. We have to negotiate and negotiate, that's fine, I am not saying it's not fine to negotiate, I am just saying, we live in an unionized environment. We should not be negotiating wages, values of wages, on the floor of Council. We negotiate so many other things with our unions, the staff do great work, but they involve negotiations. Wages should be negotiated in collective agreements not on the floor of Council. I will be supporting the motion. EPC's motion.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to say I am in favor of us moving to the living wage. Costs are identified. And I believe that the minimum…that living wage is a base, Madam Speaker. And then, from there, there is bargaining because the living wage actually changes from year to year. And that can be subject for negotiation under collective bargaining. I don't see any problem with that. And I wouldn't say...I heard from Mr. Delbridge and there is often a lot of negotiations outside of collective bargaining that happen. I know that Council itself ignored the need to actually bargain when we voted to mess with the police pension. So, the reasoning for us not moving to the living wage, it's…we can do it, Madam Speaker, and we should be doing it. This is just saying we are going to receive this as information, but the costs are minimal. And I think that we should definitely be implementing that. This report is just being received as information so I can't just vote for this. I think it is imperative that we do become a living wage employer. To set the standard for all employment places. We want to make sure we keep raising fees. Water bills are going up; we keep doing that. We voted to do that. And what happens is, people not making a living wage have a real hard time actually paying their bills related to the city services. And so, you know, we should take responsibility and try to lead by example, Madam Speaker. And I will just leave it at that. Thanks.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker, time for some truth telling. There are good things here that no one is calling into question the math and the calculations I think there was a good faith effort made by our Labor Relations folks, to try and cost this out, to the extend they could. The current Mayor, when he was a Councillor and Chair of Finance critiqued the move to a 15 dollar an hour minimum wage, which was quite a big jump in its the time, but was later overcome by provincial legislation. And then Councillor Gillingham said, well, there are cascading effects here, there's a compression costs. This will trigger a further costs. That was not included in the document that was presented to Council. Oddly it later appeared in the budget document wildly sextupling the projected costs. And the then Mayor Bowman said, well, you didn't give us that at Council, you are going to have to figure that out, words to that effect. But, the current Mayor, I think could, rightly say should he choose to. Well, I told you you should include those sorts of costs. And here they are, in front of us. And that I think is a more open and honest truth telling debate. The frustration...and Councillor Lukes touches on this is, if you are going to have a fairly grandiose OurWinnipeg, if we are going to have a fairly grandiose climate plan, you should probably try to keep to those plans or at least make efforts to keep those plans. If our approach is, we selectively take a little bit of this, and a little bit of that, ad-hoc this ad-hoc that. That is the same as not having a plan. Why do you need the plan besides your approach. Oh, we are aspire to this, and we are aspire to that. Let's pass another, pass an even tighter deadline, forgetting the net zero. We don't really put any money toward it, we don't really even mean it, but let's put it in, and it looks good. So, I think we need to maybe have a little better talk about where we are going with things like OurWinnipeg and the climate plan. I've been clubbed over the head with it, in terms of some debates here. So, what it says, expressly at 3.13 is: "Develop criteria to achieve a living wage, minimum standard for employees of the City, for those awarded contracts and subcontracts to provide city services.". So, the Mayor makes a good point, in previous meetings, so, I believe wage rate should be set through collective bargaining, I said that myself. The trouble is we are making enormous efforts to not have collective bargaining for a number of our contracted-out services. We have a very small contracts set out for transit plus. We will have a chance later today to correct rectify some of that, when it comes to garbage and recycle of garbage pick up. So, what else do we know from this report? We have said in OurWinnipeg we want a living wage for contracted, for people who work for contracted services and subcontracts beyond that. What do we say, what does our staff, who wrote that in OurWinnipeg, what does our staff say in this report? The City is not privy to what percentage is used between labor and material costs for these contracts. The City doesn't have jurisdiction nor control over the contractors work force, they independently negotiate, either directly or through a union, the wages that are paid to their employees. This information is generally confidential and not easily obtained or voluntarily shared. So, our staff is saying, we cannot possibly implement the very thing we told you we wanted to do in OurWinnipeg. They might say you voted for it, and we did. But I have real concerns that we have in OurWinnipeg provision that says we believe in a living wage for people who work, for those who have contracts with the city or subcontracts. And now, when it comes to the moment, we are told we don't know, how would we know, how could we determine that? It is generally confidential; it is not easily obtained. So, one could have sympathy, I think, for the line, like Councillor Lukes has said. I didn't follow line

painting. I didn't really follow that, one can have some sympathy for the view that we should set wages, we should bargain in here. Councillor Eadie makes extremely valid point, that the majority of Council voted unilaterally to change police pension plan, until we were unsuccessful, in an arbitration on it, trying to make that argument. So, you can make that argument, but how on earth are we to then go forward with an OurWinnipeg that says, yes, living wage for people who work for subcontractors, except we don't know and can't possibly figure out how of that would work, our staff say. I perhaps have a solution to the problem, which is why don't we bring some of the work in-house then, for garbage collection. Then we'd know what we are paying. Then we'd would know about minority hiring targets, then we have control over that workforce instead of just saying to contract it out. So, I am voting for this today. I do have some sympathy for what the Mayor has said. And there's certainly going to be a cost to this, but I am enormously frustrated with our approach on things like OurWinnipeg, or the climate action plan. None of this was passed this term. We do have strategic action plan that was passed this term, and we'll probably come into that under the consolidation of the garbage services item later today. But I think we have to be open and honest, and say, look, we have no intention of living up to that provision. We don't even know how we could, if we are saying. We don't know what wage rates, that's confidential, we don't know what wages rates they paid where we contract out services. Fine, but let's not pretend that we are going to try and implement OurWinnipeg then. So, we can take the approach. A little of this, a little bit of that. But that is not really a plan, that's just being ad-hoc, I am actually kind of comfortable with that, mostly, but I don't really know why we then passed these grandiose plans, other than to have, you know, our achievement is that we passed the plan. That's it. We don't have to implement it. Implementation is often a challenge. So, I will support this for today. My frustration though is, if we really believe that we can't implement the living wage for people working for subcontractors, well, then I guess we better look at bringing some of that work in-house.

(inaudible)

Councillor Schreyer: I want a clarification. The motion is that the report be received as information. I just want clarification. Councillor Mayes understood…

Madam Speaker: That's correct. Yes

Councillor Mayes: That's a fair question. I will retain the position I had at EPC in voting in favor of the living wage.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, next speaker Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes. So, Madam Speaker, through you, to my colleagues, I will not be supporting this report. I think the cost is not that significant, and I think that the benefits are significant. And having a city where people are living with a wage where they can pay for the things that they need to live, like rent, like groceries. And I think that we should be a leader in that, and that's why I will be voting against this report. Perhaps I can say a few words in French, I know it is going to be a long day. So, I will keep it brief.

French Spoken: **(01:06:30 to 01:09:04)**

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to support EPC's recommendation for a couple of reasons. I was rereading the motion, and I wanted to reiterate that I am supportive of a living wage. We did it in 2023, when we raised living wage to 15 dollars. But here we are a year later wanting to ask for an additional 4 dollars within a year. So, it's very troubling to see that rate go up within a year. We know it is not the City of Winnipeg's fault. It is the cost of living. Gas has gone up, rent has gone up, groceries has gone up. And so, we are all asking, of course, you know, to pay a living wage to our employees. And I don't disagree with that. But the challenge I am finding here today in making the decision is when we look at kind of a larger scheme of things, and of course my ward representing Point Douglas, one of the denser populations that lives in poverty. I want to look at kind of city wide and more of a larger approach. Yes, we have it in OurWinnipeg 2045 document, which is a much larger, you know, city-wide document. But I want to remind Council that we did a strategic action plan, where we talked about what we wanted to see within our term of office here between 2023 and 2026. It is not even in our S pack. The living wage is not in our S pack. So, if we really wanted to bring that forward, then maybe in our next term, when we do s pack revitalization, we can probably add it in there. But it was not a priority. You know what was a priority? It was funding and implementing Winnipeg recreation strategy. Something that I've pushed for, and we are doing that in our current budget. So, this is something that is kind of outside of that scope, and that's one of the reasons why I will be supporting EPC's recommendation. And I want to be very mindful of our current budget constraints. How are we going to be paying for these ever-increasing costs of a living wage, in-house, all of the things we are going to be talking today on the floor of Council? I want to be mindful of our balanced budget and moving forward. I think it's known that I am on the budget working group, so I am coming with that type of lens as well and I don't want to continue to increase our property taxes. I think that what the Mayor has done is something that is very appropriate in the

next couple years. So, I want to remain that basically be very cognizant of our current budget constraints and want to support our ongoing work through our strategic action plan. And so, those are my comments for today. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't going to speak until I heard Councillor Santos's speech. I'm kind of surprised the Councillor that represents probably the poorest neighborhood in all of Canada, if not…well, Winnipeg for sure and probably all of Canada, is speaking out against the living wage, I never thought I would hear that one. But there is always a new one on the floor of Council. But she cites a rec strategy. I don't think it is such a great rec strategy shutting down wading pools in the inner city, on kids, in some cases, some neighbourhoods getting four wadding pools shut down and then replacing them with one splash pad, that is not a great rec strategy. And so, here we have Council divided on something that I think is historically significant. I think this will go down as something that will be similar to the 40-hour workweek, I think it will go down similar to the right for people not to have to work if they are minors. I think this will go down as something that is extremely significant in the future, and why, if anybody can read what is happening in the world with AI and robotics coming in...the requirement for people to survive. It's coming, faster than we realize. And so, the living wage I think is the biggest question I have about the living wage is the establishment… is it…maybe Councillor Gilroy can speak to this in her closing remark, if she knows it. Which is, who establishes it, who benchmarks it? Is it benchmarked by Statistics Canada and the Federal Government? Ontario seems to have a system in place, from what I've researched, on how they benchmark it. And I was very interested to read in a report on business, which comes out once a month in the Global Mail, that one of the leading Credit Unions in Ontario, the CEO, she made the decision to move the organization to a living wage, even though they are a private firm, because she felt it built a team atmosphere, she argued and ensured that they sent a message to their employees that they care about their ability to afford cost of living today. I guess the greatest thing that is out of control, and we have a lot of issues that are out of our control. As we know, the cost of living. We don't know where that is going to go in the future. And if the cost-of-living rises, I am assuming the living wage will rise, no different than the minimum wage has risen to address the cost of living. That has affected business, no doubt about it. But the question is, do we want to be a low wage economy or do we want to be a more advanced economy, similar to that of Scandinavia, where we rely on higher education, accessibility to higher education, the ability for one to reach their full potential if they are blessed with certain gifts and not be stopped because they can't afford university. That is what we face today in this country. Young people not being able to go on because they can't take on that debt. And yet, we aspire to have a higher standard of living. Well, that is not going to happen by accident. I think the minimum wage is at the bottom end of the picture. It's a way of saying to folks that are out there struggling that if they need, that we have their back. And whether the cost is small today, I think it will be much larger tomorrow, there is no doubt about it. But if we as City can set the example, then other governments and hopefully the private sector, maybe we can raise the standard of living in this country. And address the coming onslaught of AI and robotics which is going to change everything. Because it is coming. So, I think it is the right thing to do. I strongly disagree with the Councillor for Point Douglas. I am shocked that the councillor representing the most…one of the poorest neighbourhoods in Canada is against the living wage. I've never heard that before, it blows my mind.

Councillor Rollins: My colleague of Point Douglas said she was actually for a living wage. What she did say is that she has other priorities, Madam Speaker. Misrepresenting her, I would like a ruling, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Wyatt: (inaudible) I appreciate the double talk by my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Order, Councillor Rollins, Councillor Rollins. Sit down. I'm…continue with your dialogue. Okay. Thank you. Any further speakers on the matter? Councillor Duncan. No. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. On this topic, obviously, a lot of heated opinions here today. You know, with respects to areas of the city that…(inaudible). Yeah exactly, it's all in the projection, right? With respect to the different areas of the city, with higher poverty areas, you know, I think it is pretty easy for those of us that live in the areas that might have a more affluent demographic in the East and West it is easy for us to get up here and say shame on certain councillors. I don't think that is fair for the councillor of Transcona to do here today. So, as one of the councillors for a more affluent area. I respect that Councillor Santos can stand up here and speak to, sticking to a priority action plan here for the City, so, I commend her for that. But to where Councillor Lukes' point, of all looking at this as a vote on the floor for wages, I do agree with that. This needs definitely, with respect to the president of the union here today, this definitely needs to take place during the negotiation period. And I would potentially be supportive of this during that period. But right now, we need to also look at the fact that Winnipeg is one of the, if not the most affordable major cities in Canada to live. The Mayor has clearly staked his claim to keeping property taxes as low as possible and having sat on the budget working group in our first four-year budget and then again being appointed here in the coming fall to work with our Chair of Finance Councillor Browaty on this. That is a struggle not having that additional funds to manage and allocate to all sorts of different needs is a struggle. However, we do have to look at this from a holistic approach. Winnipeg is affordable,

Winnipeg does have low property taxes. Winnipeg does have low housing costs; Winnipeg does have low recreation costs. And we are making investments in areas that we have heard from the public that they do want the investment. This is one of them when it comes to costs of living wage here. But at the end of the day, this is not about giving somebody another dollar or so after the benefits are considered here. This is about the cost of everything. This is about the cost of groceries, this is about the cost of our day-to-day housing supplies, this is about the cost of hospitality and entertainment. These are all costs that are controlled primarily at the federal level. And they have made this mess for Canada across the board where people are struggling, people are in poverty. And now the cities across Canada including Winnipeg are left to pick up the pieces by trying to nickel and dime everywhere we possibly can. You know, I encourage Winnipeggers and people across Canada to contact their federal representatives and say enough is enough we need correction here. I would love to say we could give people living wage of 20 dollars an hour. That is just not realistic at this point in time. You know, we are going to look at this budget, coming up here, for 2025 and hopefully there are more opportunities to make life more affordable and enjoyable in our city. We are working towards that. At this point in time, I am going to support the report to be received as information. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today again it was stated that there are a lot of heated debate discussions with respect to this matter. We have gone on this path a little while ago and had discussions. I remember the president of the CUPE union coming in and speaking in delegation, what the impacts would be for the City of Winnipeg offering a living wage. In looking at positions that are detailed in the appendix with respect to all of the different classifications and the different salary ranges that they currently have, in looking at, again, I wasn't part of the budget working group this year but, you know, but what we finally decided on as Council and voted for, in terms of four-year multiyear budget, we have had to go back and review our grant program on the basis that there were proposed cuts to the grant program, that we saw a huge lobby, out in our courtyard with respect to the grant funding that was proposed as part of that budget. We are now looking, we are now revising, we are trying to work with those communities to provide the level of funding that is sustainable for them to continue on the programming that is direly needed here in our city. So, now we are challenged with this living wage, and increasing wages to 19.21 dollars an hour for those that are making below that. And again, it provides another impact to the budget that we just passed. You know, as Councillor Duncan had stated there are areas in the city that are a bit better off financially, socioeconomically than other areas of the city. So, it's not surprising to hear Councillor Santos state that she is supportive of the living wage, but also cognizant of the impacts that we have here in the city in consideration of our budgets. Again, Mayor Gillingham has campaigned on a platform of maintaining our property taxes such as they are where we are hoping that growth in our city, growth in our revenues, in terms of development, in terms of business taxes will help increase our coffers. But right now, it's some very challenging times, It is going to be more and more expensive going forward based on the carbon tax that has been presented by the federal government. We have to do our part to make sure that those costs are taken into consideration as well, as those costs continue to rise year after year, after year. In terms of the living wage, at this point in time, you know, the City of Winnipeg has to look at its overall budget. We have to be cognizant of what we are bringing in and what we are expending. We have been doing this now for 150 years. But we've got some very challenging times right now. We have to be cognizant of when to implement something like this and when to stand firm. So, at this point my position, or my vote is to support the EPC recommendation to take this in as information. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Councillor Orlikow

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I wasn't going to speak because I was saving my (inaudible) for later on, but, just on, you know, I have been around the block awhile, this place. These comments about we have to be aware of the budget here but over there we don't care. We have to make sure we don't increase property taxes, but we can give gifts over there. And so, we did pass the CenterPlan today. Wonderful plan, I'm quite supportive of it. Understand there's a bill on that. There is the developer fee, permit fee, reductions over a couple of years. There's all the other grants. We all supported it. But 8 million dollars, how are we going to fund that? Well, we should, based on the comments that I'm hearing today about living wage, you shouldn't have supported that plan. You should have said we can't do that, because we want to know where that money is coming from, before we have to commit to it, not just refer it off to the budget. But that is what we did. So again, it is hard for me to sit here and listen to people talk about we have to be, you know, fiscally aware, fiscally conservative, make sure we invest only where we want to. We passed one, an 8 million dollars bill that we are just going to punt down the line. Instead of saying, we are taking it from the housing accelerator fund, or take it from here, or whatever. We've left it open ended. So, again people, I understand that some of the Mayor's comments about the compression issue that's valid, that's a good one. But we always have to look at our budgets, in the sense of, budgets aren't just about spending money, they are about investing money, that's also about making sure we secure money. I'll be talking later on about the money that we are going to be giving away to developers. No comment about that, but we'll talk about that later on. How the LDRs are getting impacted. We haven't talked about that yet, but we will later on. So, again, when we talk about budgeting, let it be consistent. You know, this idea of just referring things off to the budget process because we don't want to make a decision today. That is, you know, fine. We have done a lot in the past; we are doing it

more and more later. So, you're absolutely right, there are going to be some questions and issues to the budget working group. We have a debt policy now, I am not sure who mentioned it, we have zero reserves. We have a fiscal stabilization reserve that is also now our General Parks reserve, they are both the same. And all we do every time, instead of budgeting properly, we just drain it. So, again, there's a lot of issues in our budget. But again, at the end of the day I think Councillor Wyatt said it the best, we should stop trying to be lowest denominator. You know, yes, we got some good lower taxes. We also got a waste treatment plan that is completely collapsing, because we didn't deal with that, we've got Arlington Bridge, it's closed, because we didn't deal with it. We've got streets that are a mess, because we are still not dealing with it. We've got parks that are deteriorating like Kilcona Park. I'd like people to go to the Kilcona Park idea plan again. How many years is that been going around and around and around? We closed wadding pools everywhere. We've got to use LDR to backfill that, because there's not nearly enough that we've provided in the budget, that's actually, if you want an empty building whole there, I guess that is the choice of the Mayor and Council, I am not doing that. So, there are a lot of budget issues. So, the living wage though, again, we always talk about and I'm not sure if this is strategic priorities action plan seems to be gerrymandering, or whatever you want to pull and not pull it out. Fine. I knew that would happen before we did it in the first place. I got it. That is why I was always kind of leery on this whole thing. Because sometimes it's really great, especially if...you know, if one group really likes it, and it is really awesome, this is why we are doing it. There's other reasons why we want to do other things. And we change. It's not always just one thing. The strategic action plan is a living document. It does change. So, we have been talking about this living wage for years and years and years, and years. But if we want to be an employer of choice, if we want those people that we are paying more money to go back and be able to afford their homes, to be able to afford groceries, be able to take their kids to daycare and become that employer of choice, well, we've got to do this stuff. It's very important. Now, how are we going to pay for it? I don't know. I don't know how we are paying for the Centerport Plan either. But again, we will kick it down the budget, and the budget working group will have to make some hard choices going down the line. They are going to make some hard choices regardless. Because we have no reserves left. So, you can't just go back and cherry pick that pocket pot of money out. So well, the City of Winnipeg does not have a lot of funds. We are a poor city. We know that. So again, but we also need to stop this idea about let's race to the bottom first, so we all feel better about ourselves. And we didn't do this, and didn't increase a fee here, didn't do that, and developers are happy, and everybody is happy. Except for, you know who's not that happy? The people that walk out their door and see that broken sidewalk, they see those trees collapsing, they go to their park and half of the park is under water. You know, that's what makes people happy. When they look out their window, and they see a city that's working. Do I say the City of Winnipeg is working presently right now? I think we are hanging on. And hanging on and going under repeatedly. We talked about the lines, Councillor Lukes brought up, the line painter. Absolutely. Why is that not being funded? Was that in the budget working group, did they talk about that? It should have been funded. Is that a priority? We are going to have to make some hard choices. But today the choice is, I am willing to put my foot forward and say yes, let's try it out. I think that the living wage is important for people, so they know that the City of Winnipeg is an employer of choice, it's just one piece of it. So, there are a lot of other pieces. So then now it will allow us the opportunity to again, as some people said, to retain people, attract people. We are having a hard time attracting anybody to come to work for the City of Winnipeg right now. So again, this will help us become that employer of choice. So again, I understand people's budget concerns, I understand we look at it with certain lenses, but we all agree the budget is going to be difficult. We all know that. Just there's no way around it. It gets more and more difficult every year. So, whoever is on the budget working group. Like Councillor Santos said she was, thank you very much for offering to serve, but it's going to be very difficult. But again, money is one thing. People are the most important thing. We are elected for the people. And this one will help people. So, I will be voting for it.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Seeing no further speakers on the item. There was a call for a recorded vote. All in favour?

Mayor Gillingham: Do you mind if I close Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes, of course, Mr. Mayor, yes, close on the item. Thank you.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. Yeah, a lot of comments. I truthfully want to thank Councillor Rollins for just clarifying that Councillor Santos did indeed say she is in favor of living wage but there's a process by which to do it. And the process ultimately is though a negotiated collective agreement. It is not incongruent to vote to receive this as information and have a goal in OurWinnipeg of a living wage, whatever that may be. It could be achieved through the process, which is established, which is the process of collective bargaining. And that is where wages should be negotiated. One of the delegations talked about…raised…there's a couple of things that I do want to address that came from the delegates. One was that community safety officers were bargained outside of collective agreement process. Well, they were bargained but they weren't bargained...the wages were not bargained on the floor of Council, like it has been debated today. I think it is also important to point out that, you know, with respect to my colleagues. I think seven of them spoke in favor of a living wage. But yet not one, not one today on the floor of Council has identified a funding source for what will be 3.3, 3.4 million dollars a year of additional costs to the City of Winnipeg. Has anyone identified where that money is going to come from? Some have said that there's challenge in the budget, that's certainly the case. But yet, no one today has said where the funding is going to come from to pay these incremental costs. I am not opposed to higher wages, different wages for

employees, but there is collective bargaining process for that. There is a cascading impact. What has not been said today, which is very concerning is that the motion originally called not for just for the living wage, and I use that term because that's the term we are using. These wages be set for employees of the City of Winnipeg but then extend that we, as the City of Winnipeg, start determining and setting wages for third parties, i.e. private businesses and contractors. So, I just want this to make this clear. The decision that some want to make today it's not just that we establish a new base wage outside of the collective agreement for City employees. But now we are going to dictate to private contractors how much they must pay their staff. That is for sure a bridge too far, in my mind. I think we also need to realize that as we look at some of our services, yes, we have a long ways to go. But we have made some significant progress. I know a couple people have said today that we can't attract staff. But in fact, we had a problem attracting lifeguards a year and a half ago. We invested in that. Now we are attracting lifeguards, we are attracting bus drivers. Those new funds for bus drivers were set through collective bargaining, and it has been successful. We are having an easier time, or a better time of attracting and retaining transit employees all done through the collective bargaining process. I think that is important. I do take issue with the assertion that the delegate made related to our staff misleading. I can't remember exactly the whole words. I will use these words from my understanding of what the delegate was saying. Misleading Council in the report. In essence. It was in the assertion that those who wrote the report were not telling the entire truth or telling the entire story. And I defend our staff on their report and take issue with any assertion that our staff would be in any way misleading the public. I believe our staff has done their due diligence to look at what the cost implications of establishing this wage would be. One of the colleagues asked, well now, the question they had was, I think it was the councillor from Transcona who now sets the wage? Who determines this? Well, of course the Province of Manitoba, as we know, sets the minimum wage. But now, apparently, we are going to allow a third-party, in this case, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, to set other wages for us as well. So, it wouldn't be the Bank of Canada, pardon me, the …it would be this other party that is setting and establishing wages which are deemed a living wage. What was not included in the calculation was the benefits that City staff enjoy through collective bargaining. And I'm not saying they shouldn't enjoy these benefits, they should. The health benefits, the pension benefits, and others, as well, that was not part of the calculation when the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives put their calculation together. And so, I am all for good wages and fair wages. I think City of Winnipeg employees do enjoy good wages and fair wages and will continue to enjoy the City of Winnipeg as a good place to work. But really, the goal is to, for the process by which to do that is through negotiating collective agreements. So, I'm certainly continuing to support EPC's motion here to receive this matter as information and have these things a part of collective agreement and collective bargaining processes.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that I will call the vote. (Inaudible) So, a positive vote, if you vote yes, you are voting to receive this report as information. And I am out of sequence here but just got mixed up with the Mayor being remote. I'd like to put on the record that I will not be supporting this. I am challenged with private enterprise, us dictating to them. And a lot of what my colleagues said and the Mayor said, I will not be supporting this today, thank you. So, all in favor receiving the report as information?

Mayor Gillingham: Sorry Madam Speaker, sorry just to be clear, I think it's further to the question. Councillor…it's kind of the question Councillor Schreyer asked Councillor Mayes, when you say you are not supporting this, you are not supporting to receive as information or are you in support of receiving as information? Just to be clear.

Madam Speaker: I am voting to receive this as information and that is concurring with EPC's recommendation. So, all in favor of receiving this item as information please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Allard, Dobson, Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Schreyer and Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote, Madam speaker, yeas 7, nays 9.

Madam Speaker: Pardon me, it was a negative vote, yes, but there is no action as a result of that negative vote. There is no other motion put forward either, yeah, okay.

Councillor Wyatt: The matter before us today was to vote on the clause.

Madam Speaker: No, the matter before us today was to…

Councillor Wyatt: (inaudible) So, in light of denial, then the motion...then the policy is carried.

Madam Speaker: No, it is not. There is no amending motion put forward

Councillor Wyatt: Oh, come on, how do you, then?

Councillor Schreyer: What are we voting against?

(inaudible)

Madam Speaker: That's right? That was also concerning…there was no amending motion put forward. We have many others, but not on this. And I'd like to move forward. I think that we all know the rules here. (inaudible)

Madam Speaker: The next item. Madam Clerk

Councillor Wyatt: (inaudible) that the clause be voted on.

Madam Speaker: We have never done that in past practice, Councillor Wyatt. You certainly perhaps can. I would like to confer with the clerk. We have not done that in the past for any item, in 13 years. Councillor Gilroy? Councillor Wyatt would you like to move it in the motion section. Suspension of the rules.

Councillor Wyatt: Explain to me what that means.

Madam Speaker: Well, this is new territory. You are asking for suspension of the rules to deal with a new matter, because we've already dealt with this matter. I will have the clerk come over and discuss this with you.

Councillor Wyatt: My understanding is we can't bring a matter back to Council that has already been voted on within a certain period of time. So that would actually be on a voter back here.

City Clerk: You can.

Councillor Wyatt: But you can now?

Madam Speaker: We have. I'm going to have, Mr. Clerk. I would like you to go over and speak with Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Gilroy you can certainly join that. We are moving on. I agree with Councillor Rollins. We are going to be moving on. You can understand that later, I would like to move on with the meeting right now. Councillor Rollins, pardon me, Madam Clerk. The next item, please. Item five. Clerk.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker (inaudible) seek the advice of the clerk, but can we not suspend the rules and have this report completed after lunch so that…

Madam Speaker: We have dealt with the item. It would be a new matter, that's being brought forward, and we are not doing that right now, in the middle of our agenda. I would like to move to the next item. Which is Item five.

Item 5 - Remote Participation at Council Seminars for Members of Council

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

Mayor Gillingham: Yeah, I will wait to hear from my Council colleagues, Madam Speaker, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. This was stood down by…item five, Remote Participation, Councillor Gilroy.

Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Gilroy,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 5 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July 9, 2024, be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendation 1 and replace with the following:*

"1. That the Chief Administrative Officer be directed to implement remote participation at Council Seminars for all Members of Council.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I do not support EPC's decision on the remote participation. We are not…today the Mayor is actually in New York able to participate in the meeting. And the meetings that we are talking about are Council seminars, they are not even formal meetings. We have protocols now that we haven't had in the past with our integrity commissioner that really will give us the safe benefits of knowing the information and we can, as a Council, we can deem on if that information is leaked, Madam Speaker. We have an integrity commissioner in place, and we pay lots of money, Madam Speaker, to ensure that we are following procedures and protocols here at the City of Winnipeg. I see no reason why, for Council seminars, we cannot participate remotely. We have Councillors that have young children that sometimes need to be there, Councillor Allard who has had to pick up his children, I have had meetings that I couldn't get back in time, and I wasn't able to attend a Council seminar. The Council seminars are really good learning opportunities for councillors. We now have…some people have outside offices. It just makes sense, Madam Speaker, that we have ability to do it remotely. It worked very, very well, Madam Speaker, during COVID. And quite frankly, we had a high percentage of councillors' participation because they were remote. And quite frankly they were actually run a lot more smoother. Because we had the questions in question box and we were able to filter everything. Madam Speaker, this is something we should be doing. We have the technology, we have the capabilities, we have the ability. Clearly the Mayor is allowed to participate remotely. We should be able to do this. And quite frankly, any discussion around us not doing it remotely because of councillors sharing outside information, we have an integrity commissioner for that, Madam Speaker. We now have protocols and procedures in place that we didn't have before, Madam Speaker. So, I will not be supporting EPC's recommendation. I think that it is time that we move into the technical age and we have the ability to work remotely, especially for nonformal meetings like a Council seminar. And quite frankly I hope we have more of them. But we need to make sure that we have…that we do it remotely, Madam Speaker. And another thing is, Madam Speaker, we saved...under our GH emissions, we saved because staff did not have to come back and forth all the time lots of emissions, Madam Speaker. When we have to come back and forth from meetings back here, back forth. Councillor Lukes lives in the farthest part of the city, I know Councillor Duncan does. It is not good for our environment as well. It just makes no sense. These are not formal meetings. We are allowed in formal meetings back here, back, forth, Councillor Lukes lives in the farthest part of the city, I know Councillor Duncan does, it's not good for the environment as well, it just makes no sense. These are not formal meetings; we are allowed in formal meetings to participate via Zoom. I think that we should have that same ability, here in Council and I think that our staff needs to have some faith on us as Councillors, we can do this and manage this. I know that there is sometimes information we don't want to get leaked. But I think we have procedures now to deal with that. So, I will not be supporting the EPC's recommendation. I think we need to move into technological ends. So, I don't think that we don't have to be here for a Council seminar in person. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes followed by Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Lukes: Thanks, thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, yeah, I am not sure if it is Councillor Duncan or I that live furthest away from city hall and have to deal with much construction to get here. But, much construction, anyways…this is a public meeting. I think it's okay to Zoom in on public meeting. I am zoomed out. I had thought about this motion a lot of, and I really think that, for a lot of reasons, we should be supporting our downtown, we should be coming downtown. I do think that there is much better dialogue in person than over Zoom. I personally hated when we could only ask questions in the box during Zoom. It is very difficult. It is just much more personal, there's much more nuances, there's much more that we can accomplish and discuss when we meet in person. And I think Council really should be meeting in person as much as possible. And I think that the Council seminars. Even though, it takes a long time, it takes me at least 45 minutes, which is not a long time in the big picture, to get downtown. I just really believe that we should be meeting in person. These public meetings we can Zoom in on. I get that. But there's a lot of confidential things that we discuss. Yes, we have an integrity commissioner, but just because we have an integrity commissioner doesn't mean things don't go off the rails, and we have seen that a lot. I think that having them in person is really where we should be going.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Councillor Duncan followed by Councillor Allard.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I spoke to this item at EPC, and I will relay my thoughts here today. So, with regards to having these meetings via whatever method Zoom or Teams or whatever we choose is a great idea. The concern is that we have essentially no security in having any of the comments shared, whether it be questions. Maybe I will rewind back to Councillor Gilroy's comments. This is an excellent opportunity for Councillors and the Public Service to be educated on things. When you are being educated on things you ask some questions that might seem a little odd or

uneducated, some may say stupid. There is no stupid questions, as far as I am concerned. But, you know, then we flip over to the other side. There is no secure way to have these meetings. Some may say, well, you can tell somebody is recording. Well, guess what, you can't tell if somebody is sitting beside somebody remotely listening in or using another recording device. And, you know, if the mover on this is completely comfortable with any comments that they say being out in the public realm, then that is on them. I take a lot of opportunity to ask a lot of uneducated questions of the Public Service on all sorts of different matters that I want to educate myself on before we appear here in a public forum. And using the comparison of participating remotely in these public meetings, whether it be Community Committee, Standing Policy, EPC, or Council is completely different. We are not supposed to be learning on the fly here at Council. That is why we have the seminars. And a lot of the time the Public Service takes away a lot of our questions and specifically says we don't have an answer for you, we will get back to you. I would say that if some of that got out into the public realm it would be detrimental to our Public Service as well. So, I just want to make sure we are…although, I don't agree with some of the arguments around why we need to have remote sessions. I think we also need to be present as Councillor Lukes pointed out. I think that being present and discussing these matters together and having some good dialogue. I also share the frustrations that, when you are remote that doesn't afford for an ideal situation to have those back and forths, especially if you are put in a queue to answer a question typing it out. So, at the end of the day if you can't make it here, I have never heard, in my short time here going on two years, the Public Service saying we won't share any more information. Sorry, too bad you weren't there, figure it out on your own. They are always, always amendable to being, absolutely, we'll meet with you at any point in time. Somebody is taking notes. We will give you the whole presentation. So, you know, I am going to support the EPC recommendation here. I hope that people would do their very best to be in person so we can have some good dialogue. To Councillor Gilroy's point to educate one another and the Public Service. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, next speaker, Councillor Allard followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Allard: Thanks, Madam Speaker, I didn't plan on speaking to this item, because I didn't think the votes were there. Perhaps they still aren't. But now that it is on the table, and we are speaking to it. I guess I'll speak to it. Just in terms of what…I heard one of my colleagues saying about asking questions. I got a quote here, I just loaded or not…okay, I'll paraphrase: Seneca, I can ask a question appear to be a fool for a day or I can ask the question and hear the answer and be wiser for the rest of my life. I don't understand, Madam Speaker, why we have a special rule for Council seminars. I have a question perhaps, through you to my colleagues who sit on Executive Policy Committee, do we have remote participation in other meetings that are private, such as report briefing? Do we have remote participation in other meeting such as the budget working group? Or is it just Council seminar? Because that would be interesting to know. If the argument is private meeting equals no streaming, then that is a consistent argument. If we are having private meetings which in the past I know have occurred with certain members of Council and the administration is there, some members of Council are there. If those are allowed, then presumably that argument fails. But I know that it is not always about logic and if things make sense or not in politics. My uncle told me one time, he's a professor of philosophy when I told him my origin story when I decided to, Madam Speaker study politics and not economics, was that little star at the end of the page that says all things being equal, all these economic metric models. And I said, well, it's my teacher, if all things being equal is almost never true, then why do we even study this topic? And my teacher at the time said, Matt, I think you should go and study politics, because clearly this is not a place for you if you are concerned about that. So, my real material concern about remote work. I have several, the report of the CAO on remote work, in terms of Public Service with savings. It showed how it is a tool for retention of staff. And I think as Council, we set the tone, and if City Councillors are expected to attend some meetings in person and do not have access to those meetings through remote participation, I think that sends the wrong message. So, I think the form on this report says that there is savings on staff, and there is a benefit for staff. I know that there are huge savings in terms of the person who doesn't need to commute every day, particularly if they live further out in the city, and particularly if the transit levels are not adequate in order for them to get to work to and from on time and without sacrificing hours of their day. So, Madam Speaker, if we want to have diversity and people who represent different areas of the City in Winnipeg, I think a lot of people. I mean, we all know, Madam Speaker, that we live under a microscope as City Councillors. There is a lot of challenges to the job. And for someone to be considering whether or not to make a career in politics, whether or not they can be an equal participant or not, surely it would be part of that equation. And I know that there are several situations that happened in the past, I am sure there will be in the future. There has been just recently this week, where I was not able to participate in person because daycare was out, school was out and so I was the guy. And I couldn't leave my seat, but I could have participated in a Zoom meeting. And so, for many reasons. On this Watergate style argument that we could potentially see leaks, I mean, we can record, and any of these devices can record. It is legal in Canada, as long as you are part to the meeting to record meetings. It's often misunderstood because in American law, depending on the state it is or isn't. In Canada you can. So, a City Councillor who would choose to in person record a meeting would not be breaking the law and would then have a detailed record of what was said or not said, questions, answers from the administration. And then could without engaging in libel or slander could say I have heard from X and that would be…I shouldn't speak algebra in my speeches…I have heard from a member of Council, a member of the administration, and be more specific than that, and all that would be on the cell phone. So, what is the big deal with having a meeting? Is it because it's a video, and it could be more sensational? I don't quite

understand the distinction between…well, I do understand the distinction between Council seminar, report briefing, budget working group briefings. If we are going to be consistent about an application of private versus public meetings, I think it has been a whole lot less meetings with Councillors and Public Service, because often times, because of various commitments, we are unable to attend in person. And I think it is of particular importance to people who have young families. And that's one of the reasons that I remember reading about, that politicians tend to be a little bit older in life, generally speaking. Because they are the people that have the time to engage in politics. Well, if we just take a little bit of time away from those people who might engage in politics because they have to commute to and from work, that is not a good thing. I think it is not the right message. It says if you have other obligations in your life, you need not apply. And then, in terms of the Public Service, I think it sends wrong message, in terms of we should be encouraging telework because it saves on environmental, it saves on greenhouse gas emissions, it saves on commutes, so there's more money in people's pockets. It is a benefit, because you can add another, you know, sometimes three, four hours to your day. According to my favorite author, that I quoted for many times. Claude Smill, who cites the latest commuting information from the U.S. commuting times are at all-time high. This is going to become a bigger and bigger issue as cities expand and expand, and people want access to larger properties and still want access to downtown. This is part of the solution. This is part of the solution of modal shift. We are talking the Transportation Master Plan about achieving modal shift targets. We are…I understand targets are moving. But at least we are talking about the mode shift. That is a positive. But I think we should be consistent, and I don't think it is consistent that Council seminars are…seem to have a special status in terms of not allowing for remote participation.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I actually don't understand any kind of reasoning that would say you couldn't attend a seminar via Zoom. Why not allow that? There is a long list of circumstances, Madam Speaker, that a person might not be able to make the seminar but still come in in Zoom. So, I know I missed the governance review for the amendments, so I missed that seminar, Madam Speaker. Now, I was at home sick. That would have been great if I could have listened in on Zoom, because, I mean, we are still looking for more days to deal with some improvement for conflict in definitions, but also when I look at confidentiality of information, how can I say, so, there are discussions that happen in-camera, especially related to business contract matters or whatever. There's human resources, right? But I am not sure that you all know but they are and can be subject to the public interest. The actual FIPPA legislation discusses public interest and when it may be applied. So, in terms of seminars and what we are being presented, you know, if the concern is people being in Zoom and then, next thing you know, they are releasing information that the Public Service and/or the governance leadership on Council doesn't want people to hear at least until things can be managed sometimes might be the reason, Madam Speaker. But, you know, Madam Speaker, again, if you are worried about somebody zooming in, I will first give you...I will give you another example. After surgery, I was laid out for…and not able to go anywhere. Now, there wasn't a seminar that I can think, but I mean, I attended the Council meeting and there was a report on the table that I was very concerned and needed to be part of that meeting. Now if there was a seminar, I would liked to have zoomed in to hear the Public Service take on that issue and ask questions. And so, again, if the reasoning is about somebody on Zoom releasing information, like, what we as members of Council have to realize is the integrity commissioner…we have a responsibility, Madam Speaker. For example, so, the budget process was widened out a little more and Council as a whole, attended progress reports in a seminar. Now, Madam Speaker, releasing anything that comes out of progress report. Madam Speaker, if somebody wants to go back to a really closed budgeting process, if you are leaking information that actually hasn't even been fully decided yet, you are doing a disservice and, when people think about releasing information, they have to consider that, Madam Speaker. So, again, why wouldn't you allow somebody in the seminar via Zoom? Again, I will just say it. I don't know if you all read my e-mail in regards to the changes being proposed for the code of...Members of Council Code of Ethical Conduct. There is a lot to express, and I hope everybody has read it. Because to say everything in a seminar is confidential. Like, really? I don't really understand it. Usually, we are presented something that actually, you know, I didn't see really many changes to some reports out of seminars. What they present is basically what it ends up being, Madam Speaker. So, what is the problem? And is it information that is in the public interest? So, there could be a seminar on...well, actually, I was on the Police Board, Madam Speaker. And I learned that Property and Development was working with the police service. This is a seminar on the new north district station. And I am sitting there and the land that they want to take, I use the word steal, was in the public interest because they were taking away green space, well in the end, north district station will be opening up I think in September…the point being is that there is a public interest time to release it. So, but again, allowing a Councillor into a seminar via Zoom…what does that…? It has nothing to do with somebody else could have been zoomed in on that seminar. But I am the one sitting there knowing that it is in the Mynarski ward's public interest. But it's got nothing to do with having attended by Zoom. It has to do with what is that information and is it seriously in the public interest to learn? Because, basically, I use the word taking park space away from an area that is actually short on good sport fields and all kinds of things like that. So, Madam Speaker, I just…let's go into some reasons for zooming. Again, I gave one. I had an operation. Can't go anywhere. But City business continues. And you have to stay on top of that because, you know, you're going to be coming back, you are not off Council anymore. Anyway, I can't support the EPC recommendation here. I think it should have been allowed. But the only issue we have to deal with is having the proper technical equipment to do it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Thank you. Councillor Chambers followed by Councillor Orlikow. Now, seeing the hour, we will have one more speaker and then maybe we can…or finish the item, at least. Ok? Motion to work past…

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, we have a special meeting that we need to attend too at exactly noon.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, our Clerk was just informing me of the same. So, I would like to now adjourn Council and reconvene at…

Councillor Wyatt: I would like to rise on a point of order. Madam Speaker, you as the Chair have a right to inform us on a vote, on how you are going to vote, but you do not have a right to speak from the Chair on the item, which you did. So, I request that those comments be stricken from the Hansard. That is my point of order.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt, I did that today for a couple reasons. Thank you. We'll talk about that over the recess, which we are going to have right now. And I would like you to come to work on time, too, please. This morning, I know that you were late. Thank you. Reconvene at 1:15 p.m. Is that enough time for the Water and Waste meeting? Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
July 18, 2024, at 1:15 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of July 18, 2024. Councillor Wyatt. I would like to acknowledge that I did speak from the speaker's Chair earlier. I thank you for bringing that to my attention. I inadvertently did so. Moving on now to…yes....

Councillor Wyatt: No, I would just like to rise as well, to ask you to retract your statement earlier that you made about me being late for the meeting today. You know why I was going to be late. I told you why last night, and I'd like to give you that opportunity…

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. That will be done so, and also the items about the living wage. Ok? Thank you. We are on item 5 - Remote participation at Council Seminars for Members of Council. And I would speak to you further actually, Councillor Wyatt, as well, on that one item you brought forward offline, if we may. Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: Why, which item are we talking about now?

Madam Speaker: Both items, if you wish, and specifically the first one. Yeah.

Councillor Wyatt: Which was first one? Which one was first?

Madam Speaker: You had mentioned the statement of you being late…

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I had spoken to you that I was going to be late. Do you wish to inform the chamber why?

Madam Speaker: And we can speak offline.

Councillor Wyatt: I would be more than happy to speak again offline as I advised you last night why. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: (inaudible) I want to thank members of Council (inaudible) remarks, a lot of interesting points have been made, in true form and intent of our Council seminars, it is about providing or keeping information provided in our Council seminars in a confidential matter until the Public Service updates Council and releases the final information to the general public. It is crucial in this format for a couple of reasons. Firstly, a lot of information that we receive in Council seminars is embargoed until it's properly vetted and adjusted to reflect council's true intention. Premature disclosure or incomplete or tentative data can lead to misinformation and confusion among the public. And it might undermine the trust in Council's decision-making process. Secondly, confidentiality ensures that Council members are able to engage in open and uninterrupted dialogue and conduct candid and informal conversations and discussions and deliberations without any external pressures or influence. This also increases opportunities for more thoughtful and well considered discussions. It also prevents potentially misuse or misinterpretation of the information that could harm or disrupt stakeholders in ongoing

projects. You know, to Councillor Allard's remarks on older politicians. And I do consider myself an older politician, relatively older. I made the conscious decision to wait until my sons were older before putting my hat in the ring. No disrespect or judgement to any members of Council here with younger children who add a lot of value in terms of inputs, in terms of perspective and overall commitment to your elected status. For me, you know, I am glad that I waited so I do not have to make decisions between my children's needs and the responsibilities of my office. That is all I am saying.

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

Councillor Chambers: I do not have to make decisions between my children's needs and the responsibilities of my office. I do not. I am not casting dispersions.

Councillor Allard: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I have the impression it's being said that those who have children cannot make the same type of contribution.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Councillor Chambers I will give you the opportunity to restate, I missed some of what you said. I've got Council texting me and e-mailing me, all the same time. Thank you.

Councillor Chambers: I prefaced my comments by saying I do appreciate the value and do respect the input and the commitment that each member of Council has in this chamber. Ok? I am not casting any judgment or any dispersions on any member of Council. But I have witnessed embargoed information discussed with me moments after leaving the room where the sessions took place. Maintaining confidentiality until the final vetted information is released allows for coordinating communication strategy, ensuring that the public receives clear, accurate and consistent messaging from their municipal leaders, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

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

Councillor Orlikow: This is interesting. I think it's really a no-brainer that we should allow seminars. So, here is why I have cameras...allow people to participate in seminars through camera wherever they may be some really good comments today. The point of seminars, and correct me if I'm wrong, it that we have everybody involved. So, we shouldn't be putting roadblocks up for people who may have children or may have a sick parent if you're on the other side of the coin, they may be out of town on a conference, they may be doing a lot of other things. So, I thought…the idea there, for a seminar is to find ways that we can have everybody to participate, either in person, and sometimes situations arise where they can't. But I do value all your voices. So, it would be nice you we were able to have the voices in the room. So, rather than putting up roadblocks, saying no, you have hot buns, or cold seats, or whatever you want to phase it. It can be where, because, you know, sometimes Councillor Allard or Councillor whoever it is the away. But I do kind of miss it because I think their input would be good. Now, that is my opinion. So, what about confidentiality? Oh my God, okay, first of all, what is a seminar? I'm not even sure what a seminar is any more. So, sometimes there are seminars, where we actually get information on whether a policy, I'm going to talk to...some...we had seminar recently, which was a dog and pony show, about some PDOs. That wasn't a seminar, we had tons of other people involved that weren't part of Council. What is that? But they called it a seminar, but it wasn't a seminar, it was a show in town. That wasn't a seminar. But it was classified as a seminar. So, that aside. Confidentiality. Well, if you believe, councillors, be true to yourself. If you believe what you say in the room will never be spoken outside that room, get real. That is not the way it works. Anything you say publicly, or even internally it is going to be considered public. I got creamed when I thought I was having confidential emails, discussions with city planners. All of a sudden, all those emails popped up, in the courts. Why? Because they are not confidential. You want to ask question to Administration, those are privy, anybody can look at that stuff. So, again, to say, oh I can ask questions inside, you know, no one is going to say anything, well, that is quite naive. Be careful on that. If you send out an email to the Administration, that is also available to the public, if they FIPPA it, they will figure it out. That's just what happened to me. So, what about confidentiality? How many times have we seen councillors all the way back to Councillor Harvey Smith, who is the classic one on this one, who just take the document, walk out halfway in the meeting and give it to someone. That happens right now with people who are in the seminar. They actually are there already. Is that as bad as some, to warrant the fact that we want to exclude people that can't make it to the seminar, because of confidentiality? Well, guess what people? It is really about the people. You can put all the rules in place, you can put all the levels down you want, but if the person wants to leak information, they are going to do it. Then we have another system that applies in after that. That is fine. So, again, I believe the point of seminars, which I believe are specific things, not these other things that we are doing, are designed to have all councillors participate as best we can. Councillor Allard is absolutely right. If you are worried about someone doing the video sub screen on you, well, I could easily record it at that meeting and just release the recording. You're not going to know who did it. So, now our next step will be taking away phones. No one is allowed to have a phone in the office… at a seminar. Is that our next step? You know are we going to have to change our clothes, so no one is holding a bug. I don't know. Let's get off of it a little bit people, relax, you know, trust each other a little bit. There will be a few leaks in here. But I think our goal should be to have people, all councillors finding ways that they all can participate. I agree with Councillor Lukes, you should if you can show up. It is a good

dialogue. But if you can't, we shouldn't say too bad, so sad, we don't want to hear your voice. That's wrong. So, I will supporting allowing people to Zoom in from wherever they are for our seminars.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, I will be brief, I wasn't necessarily planning to speak to this. I see both sides of this issue. And again, you know, perhaps the process that would allow there to be vote, like we do for a Council meeting. We are expected to show up in person. If you have a Council seminar, we have a vote those attending them, perhaps have a vote to decide if they can participate remotely. Maybe sometimes, you know, a topic is very safe, and we are not worried about something leaking out at that time. Sometimes that may not be the case. I mean, for me one thing that I know that hasn't been brought up, is sort of the ability to be a little more frank than you are. If you know that the people in the room are the only people in the room. Like, I will give you an example. There was an acronym used in one of the Council seminars, it had been used over and over again. And I actually did not know what it meant. If I knew there was a person in the media sitting there listening in to me perhaps with one of my colleagues or somebody was recording us I could look dumb to ask that question in front of the room, but I had to ask because I didn't know what it stood for. I had never seen it. So, I don't know, sometimes that level of frankness that you get when you know that it's just the people in that room and sure, someone can quote you, and say, I can't believe Browaty didn't know this or that. But that is another wrinkle perhaps to suggest that people should be in the room. So, again, I do agree, we should try to allow as many people to participate as possible. And there are instances where, for very good reasons, you may not be able to be in the room physically. So, I don't know, I did vote against this at EPC, I am not planning on changing my vote at the moment. But I think that on a case-by-case basis, you know, it should be an exception not a rule, but if a member of Council has a very legitimate reason not to be there, and everyone else is fine with it, I think perhaps on a case-by-case basis we can look at it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Good comments. By many…good comments by Councillor Browaty. I was trying to figure what that acronym was. But no, I will leave that to a later…private conversation…two or three things. When I saw this, my reaction was what are you talking about? We can already attend Council seminars remotely. And they said no, actually you can't, I was amazed by that, so, it seems to me that there has been a shift here in the culture over the past four years so this would seem completely run of the mill for me, Second point, Councillor Gilroy is right, there is some environmental benefit for not requiring people to drive all the way in, if they otherwise weren't going to come. For example, our employee plan saved half of as much emissions as the entire Kenaston project is going to. So, we seem to give that some weight, so let's give this some weight too, in terms of our own automobile usage. But the third point really is, we just came from an in-camera session. Very good work by councillors on there. Lots of questions. We had a similar one two days ago, from Councillor Gilroy, four or five people on remote today. that weren't our staff, external counsel, external consultants, internal people. None of them in the room. We are in-camera. I don't know who else might be sitting in their office. I am dropping "f" bombs like crazy, as is my style. Gilroy often...various people have sent...all have questions. Some quite angry with the staff on some stuff. Others where staff defended themselves well. But we don't…it's just a bad dynamic, we don't just trust the councillors. Everyone else can attend remotely, you can have anybody sitting in your office. We trust them. But you, however, you might have somebody sitting there just off the camera range. What? Like, we have to have some faith in each other. This reminds me very slightly of the first budget after then Mayor Bowman was elected. Where we where told that the budget, the drop budget books are upstairs in this room, you can sign in and out, but you can't take them with you. And my what question was can the staff take them? Oh yeah, yeah sure they take them home at night and stuff. It's like, what the hell makes them come up with that? The only people we don't trust. 9,000 members of civil service is okay, but the 15 of you not so much. Come on, like this is...Councillor Orlikow already took my Harvey Smith example, so I won't repeat that. People leak stuff if they are there in person. So, I really don't think there is a huge security loss here. And if there is, I guess the future in-camera meetings we are going to have people flying in from out of Province to come to our in-camera meetings. Because, surely we can't have staff attending remotely and the Councillors are have been told they can't attend remotely.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on this? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: ***French Spoken:*** **(2:25:55 to 2:30:31).**

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Deputy speaker if you could please take the Chair, and I would like to address.

Deputy Speaker: I take the Chair, but Madam Speaker, just for clarification, it is my understanding there is also an amending motion.

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Wyatt, you go ahead and then I would like to speak.

Councillor Wyatt: Sure, thank you Madam Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker. Okay, thank you. I rise...I find it interesting the debate on Council seminars. The charter is actually the governing body of this Council. And the Charter is actually quite clear. Spells out in division 4 of the charter clause 78, subsection 1: The provisions of this division do not apply to seminars convened by some or all members of Council or a Committee of Council for the purpose of receiving information or discussing policies and other matters that affect the city. The headline is called Council seminars. Now what is interesting is that when you read that clause and read the division, the division clearly states all the rules we must follow, i.e. our meetings, quorum requirement, in-camera requirements, when something can be confidential or not confidential. It refers councillor's voting obligations; it even refers to matters pertaining to code of conduct pertaining to Council Committees. But it then comes along with Council seminars following all those clauses. And it says the provisions of this division do not apply to seminars. In other words, we can't write a code of conduct that says a Council seminar is now secret. The purpose of Council seminars is for receiving information or discussing policies and other matters that affect the city. Therefore, I would argue anyone who tries to say that any information at Council seminar is confidential and can't be shared is in violation of the charter. The charter is clear. We cannot write a code of conduct over top of the charter. Not allowed. We have to follow the Charter. And what is really fascinating is that it does talk about code of conduct pertaining to meetings and in-camera items, but it refers to all of our existing Committees before that. Our Standing Committee, EPC and Council. Council...By-laws Clause 74, division 4: Council may by By-laws establish rules governing. (a) the procedure and conduct of Council, Council Committees, and subcommittees and other bodies established by Council, the conduct of members, and the conduct of members of Council Committees and other bodies established by this Council; and (b) the circumstances under which meetings of Council, or of its Committees or subcommittees, may be conducted by means of electronic or other communication devices as permitted under section 81. But then you come along that was again, Section 74. You come to 78, subsection 1. It says: the provisions of this division do not apply to seminars, under the headline Council seminars. So why are we going on about secrecy again? We are breaking the actual Charter. This came to me when the Mayor rose recently on the issue of the grants two meetings ago, and I wanted to share information on the seminars. Well, I am not going to have seminars if you're going to share information before Council. This was before EPC and the Mayor backtracked on the whole 2.1 million dollar cut to grants in the following meeting. So, I started looking into it and I came across this. And I find it ironic now that we have completely forgot the Charter and nobody has reminded us that seminar cannot be held in secret. And if they are, they are contrary to the Charter and no councillor has been in violation if they are sharing any information, because the purpose is for receiving information or discussing policies or other matters that affect the city. Indeed, the division before that speaks specifically to in-camera items and what should be in-camera. This clause is not subject to that. As stated in the foregoing: The provisions of the division do not apply to seminars convened by some, which I find interesting. That means some members can call a Council seminar. I think that could be quite interesting now. Based on, we said only certain people could call seminars. Based on what I am reading here. Some members can call the seminar. No definition on how many. I don't think the Charter wanted a definition. I think that the purpose of Council seminars was to share information. That's why it was placed into the Charter. The idea that we need that extra Committee sometimes for all members of Council to receive information. I am assuming that is why the legislators put it there. The body that governs us, so this nonsense about whether we have Zoom or not. Even before, it is ridiculous. It really is. This is for sharing information. This is for sharing information. What is the purpose of this debate? Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Councillor Schreyer here, if may, point of order or information.

Deputy Speaker: What is your point of order?

Councillor Schreyer: Given the gravity of what Councillor Wyatt has just said, as he has quoted our Charter. This looks pretty big to me, in terms of quoting the Charter on stuff like this. We might need our Chief Clerk and/or Chief Administrative Officer to weigh on this. If what he is saying is true, as he is quoting it…

Deputy Speaker: I accept your point, but Councillor Schreyer, you could ask the question of CAO. But first, I would like...you are wanting to get the take from the CAO. I will point out that the former Mayor decided that the Mayor would not be the Chair or the organizer of a seminar, which is referred to in the Charter. But now the Chairperson of any seminar is the CAO and the Public Servants, Managers, who present the information, right? So, I'm not sure that the Charter necessarily is in play, but we could actually, actually maybe the Clerk would be better to answer your question.

Councillor Schreyer: If I may Deputy Speaker, I'm not saying that this is necessarily going to resolve this while we are debating this motion. But this is something that will have to be if not right now, not today, but dealt with by the Chief Administrative Officer and/or the Chief Clerk by the next time we come back from prorogation.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Mr. Deputy speaker, if I may…

Deputy Speaker: Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma, I'm going to ask the Clerk to indicate the professional's perspective on what was presented by Councillor Wyatt.

City Clerk: Sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so Division four of City of Winnipeg charter speaks to meetings of Council and its Committees. And as the Councillor indicated, it provides a lot of information on how Council can run its committees including moves of adjournment, quorum, decisions, tie votes. And as he pointed out, it does also say that we can create a By-law to stipulate, which matters may be considered in-camera. So, as we go down to Section 78.1 of the charter, which talks about the provisions of the division, which do not apply to Council seminars. So, those divisions, so these rules that are in place, for Council meetings and Committee meetings do not apply to the Council seminars.

Deputy Speaker: Okay, now, can I just get clarification on what makes a Council seminar? When I first started, Council seminar was arranged by the Mayor...

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may…I honestly want to move referral of the item. Could I do that? Because this is getting to be a long-winded discussion…

Deputy Speaker: Alright, Okay.

Councillor Sharma: No, I am just making a comment.

Deputy Speaker: Councillor Allard…

Councillor Sharma: I am asking the Chair…

Deputy Speaker: Yes, Councillor Sharma I just wanted to make sure. Councillor Sharma, one moment, and you will be able to proceed. I just wanted to clarify at least a portion to Councillor Schreyer, who is raising a point of order. And the matter can be dealt and the matter that you were talking about. So, I thank the Clerk for pointing that out, and we will get an answer as to what constitutes a Council seminar versus an administrative seminar. Thank you. No? Alright. I think Councillor Sharma has a motion to introduce.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have heard a lot of viewpoints on this matter, which I can certainly appreciate. I would like to move referral, and I believe I have a few minutes to explain why. I think this is less about confidentiality. It is a lot about inclusive participation. And for me personally, it's about collaboration. We have had some of the best meetings, informal meetings of this Council, that the Governance Committee has convened. And, if I recall, most of those meetings we've had a lot of the members of Council in person. And again, I think we could strike a balance here from everything we have heard today on the floor. So, I do move referral back to the Executive Policy Committee.

Deputy Speaker: Alright, okay. And there's no debate on that. I am going to call the question. And because I can't see, all those who are for referral please rise, if you can. Mr. Clerk.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Allard, Duncan, Eadie, Gilroy.

City Clerk: The vote, Mr. Deputy Speaker, yeas 12, nays 4.

Deputy Speaker: Alright, referral has passed. And that's referring the amending motion by Councillor Gilroy, I believe.

City Clerk: Correct, the item with the amending motion.

Deputy Speaker: Yes, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will take the Chair back. Moving on to item six.

Item 6 - Establishment of a Tri-Level Agreement - Inner City Revitalization

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

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I would like to move this back to EPC please, for referral back.

Madam Speaker: Any comments you wish to make? Councillor Gilroy, any comments you wish to make?

Councillor Gilroy: I can, yeah. Am I allowed to? Yes. Okay, sorry. Just a note of what our Mayor had said today about his interest with work doing with derelict vacant buildings. There could be some opportunity here if there was kind of a tri-level agreement, especially around things, like our buildings, garbage, and also, we know that our youth crime has gone up. There could be a real good discussion I think this would take time and would take, you know, the Mayor meeting with his counterparts. But really good dialogue on how we could have some sort of tri-level agreement and helping maybe support some of the actions that we need to take around the vacant derelict buildings, because I do think that the issue is something that we cannot solve alone. And there will be some money needed to deal with the multiple issues we are seeing around vacant derelict buildings and properties. So, I think that maybe if I had more of an opportunity to dialogue with the Mayor, see what we can come up with and hear his thoughts on this, I would like that opportunity, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor do you wish to address? And call the question?

Mayor Gillingham: I am fine with that. Call the question please, yeah.

Madam Speaker: All in favor of referral back to Executive Policy Committee? Contrary? That is carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 12 - Development Pre-Application Process

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, the pre-application process has been used by some, not all, but some developers and by our staff as well. The intention ultimately of the pre-application process is to get some things ironed out for those that are developing property in advance. Sorry, I have got construction happening outside this wall here, so I will try to make my comments quickly. What has happened though, unfortunately, is that too frequently some applications or not even applications, but some development potentially gets stuck in, for a long period of time, in the pre-application process. So, the motion here really, we talked about this with our City staff in advance of this. It is to eliminate the pre-application process in an effort to speed up development applications but also to do so in such a way that, as you can see one of the clauses there, would require a response from Water and Waste in a timely manner as to whether or not there was sewer and water capacity related to the area where the development is potentially to occur. So, we want to make sure that our staff can respond in a timely manner, but also those that are seeking to develop can get responses from our staff in short order. And…we just don't want, you know, in any way the pre-application process to become, which it seems to have become, in certain cases, not always, but in certain cases, just an extended timeline. It is taking in some cases far too long to really get an application through the pre-application process and into a formalized registered application. So, the goal here is to ensure that development can happen sooner. Questions will still be asked, and questions will still be answered by staff, but in the need where we need more housing built sooner, this is one way to reduce red tape.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, next is Councillor Wyatt followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, the issue affecting the application process is not the pre-applications. Pre-applications are voluntary, not required of applicants, if they don't want to. And ironically, the pre-application process works. The turn around is pretty quick, it's about three months, no more than four you get your results back from the pre-application. And, it's actually a very useful process for people making applications, because all the departments respond in an extremely detailed manner outlining all of the various issues that may come up during the application process. The issue is not the pre-application, which is voluntary, we are talking about abolishing that here. The issue is not that. The issue is the application process. So, we, through red tape, reduced the amount of hearings. By the way, through the red tape commission we created the pre-application process, actually, to try to streamline to get issues out onto the table, so that applicants knew what they were. And it is actually doing that. What I want to understand, the issue we need to tackle is not that. The issue that we need to tackle is not our hearing process. The red tape commission recommended we no longer lay matters over more than twice, two meetings. Which means basically a matter can only be at Community Committee for a total of 90 days, three months. Then a decision has to be made. So, I ask this Committee, or this Council

why is it taking the Public Service up to a year or more to get applications to the desk of the hearing body? The hearing body has to make a decision, an actual decision and recommendations. All of us Councillors, who sit on hearing bodies at our respective Community Committee, we are making recommendations, we are approving developments, sometimes with detailed amendments, hard work that you are doing, and we all do it within 90 days. What is preventing the entire…and that's with (inaudible)…returning calls to constituents, going to events, all the other things that you on a daily basis, and staying on top of your reports. What is preventing the entire department of Planning, Property and Development from getting an application to a hearing body within the same 90 days? Now it is taking like a year, I am hearing, to come forward, and even longer. That is the front end, Madam Speaker. The back end is even worse. Because then they got to get and execute a development agreement signed off by Legal. And that is taking up to 18 months. And I am not exaggerating, these are not our one offs, by the way, Madam Speaker. This is now becoming the norm. The Director who we hired last year, I believe it's one year now, has massive, delegated authority to reorganize her department, to reorganize resources. This does not fall on any member on the Standing Committee or the Chair, by the way of Property and Development. I want to make that clear. We've already delegated authority to the senior Public Servant to reorganize resources, as necessary, to make this a priority. And I thought that was one of the priorities. That and the permit division. That's another story I am not going to get into. To make this a priority so that this can start moving again. And when she reorganizes, and when she realigns resources, and then, then, if you need more resources as a director then come forward to EPC and make your case. But don't do so until you do everything you can within your mandate and within your department, and within your resources to make it happen. Because I haven't seen that. And I am not blaming the individual planners either. They are doing what they can with the resources they have, and I enjoy working with them. And I hear their pain as well, in terms on how much we spend on planning per capita versus other cities, I know that is a big part of the issue. There is no doubt about it. We won't have growth and development, but we've kind of taken away, over the years, from departments that are less, how should I say, front-line in terms of constituent calls or what not, you know. And this is one of them. And so, this Madam Speaker, is going…and Number 13 is the same. I know I can't speak to it. But the traffic studies. Sometimes the traffic study is crucial. I thought it would limit based on the size, but it is actually going the other way. It could be as many as you want, by the way the next report reasons say. I am not too sure…this looks like we are playing maybe this is about sending a message that we are trying to do something. So, we are sending the message out there to the business community. Because I understand that the business community has met with the Mayor and the Premier and has expressed significant concerns about this, according to the Presidents and CAOs that I have been talking to over the last couple months. They have been expressing concern about this. And they know this is an issue for the city. And they have advised, by the way, that businesses are thinking about leaving the city because we don't have our house in order. This is not going to do it. This is actually a tool that is useful right now, ironically. And it costs only about 300 dollars, I think, it is actually less…for them to get all this information out. Water and Waste I agree wholeheartedly with the statement. Water and Waste has this crazy clause that gets them out of whatever, you know, subject to you hiring consultants and engineers then we will consider your matter. So, let me understand this. Transit has to comment. Public Works has to give their comments. Every other department in the city basically has to give comments on an application. But Water and Waste doesn't have to. No, no, you got to hire an engineer and let us know. The same department, by the way that refused to put the entire system of sewers and pipes online like every other city has. You got to hire an engineering firm to guess where the pipes are. Every other city has them online.

Councillor Mayes: Refuses to put is a little different perhaps a little stronger…

Councillor Wyatt: Well, okay, I will revise...thank you to the Chair, and again, no knock to the Chair, he is not the minister. Nobody is a minister here, he doesn't have to know all. But you are right. Maybe they have not made a priority to put it on the system at this point. Good point. Thank you for the correction. But you know, all I know, Madam Speaker, is that there are so many other steps we can take right now that can make this process more efficient. And I hear the pain of those out there who are making the applications. And a lot of times they go through a long process, but they want to do the public consultation with the community, which is wonderful. And yeah, actually some developers take it a step further and do more consultation than what was recommended by the planners. But the feedback they get in the pre-apps is actually quite useful. At least, that what, when I had my other hat on, I found it actually very useful. And it's a shame if we lose this. So those are my comments, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, next is Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to getting rid of pre-app. They are actually, the rationale presented. The pre-app goes to all the departments. And Water and Waste should be answering the question right there, whether or not what they are proposing can be sustained by the sewer system. And a lot of those questions do get answered. I don't see that it slows down the process. And then as a matter of fact, what it does do is well, I'll give you an example. So, you have a property where in the future there might be a new bridge built and you send out letters after the plan is in place and Council has said yes, that is the direction we are going. Letters go out to the existing owners telling them that when we proceed to build a new bridge, we will be needing to expropriate X portion of your property. Now the new owner, who has new ideas about what they want to do on that lot and, one way for them to find out that information,

like, you can call and ask the administration the questions. But that is exactly what the pre-app does. It gets the various departments to reply in terms of what's being proposed to be built as to whether or not that's going to be able to proceed or not. What is the deal? And yet, so if you don't do the pre-app. You don't know that it exists, and you come in with your application, and then, oh, somebody remembers, okay, we will tell you what you are just submitting, it can't be built. So, they have got to go back to drawing board anyway. That's a waste of time, isn't it? Why not get it done upfront? I know that we are not taking. Actually, the Administration has already being told not to take pre-apps. Well, there is another property in my ward that has all kinds of different departments and different sections of departments that need to provide input about what it is. The pre-app is not slowing anything down. It is forcing everybody...you have got to answer the questions now. And the Administration has to take a serious look and say well, no, you can't do it because of this, or you can't do it because of that. Again, somebody comes in with application, and they didn't know one aspect. They are going to come in there and they are going to have to change it anyway because Council in the end is not going to pass it with that. So, like, anyway, I think the most appropriate, Councillor Wyatt pointed out many of the things regarding the pre-app. But Report 13 was pulled down too, I'll speak to traffic reports and stuff at that point. Anyway, I am not voting to get rid of the pre-app.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I think I am speaking more today than I did all year. I miss you guys in the summer. I don't. So, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. I was actually quite shocked. I will be straight up. Dismayed when I saw this as walk-on item. Why? I am thinking myself. Why would it just be walk on. No report, no discussion with Administration, no Committee to vote with the Planners there to validate this idea that these voluntary...which is about 35 of them in a year, some are red tape thing that is slowing down development. If that is the contention, I don't have a report that says that. (inaudible) It's a walk on. And then this comes out. And I go, well that is weird because I find pre-applications very good. I remember, as Councillor Wyatt brought it up, this was part of the red tape commission. So, we can actually move the things forward and before developers start committing massive and massive amounts of money on formal applications for 610 dollars, they can get all the departments coordinated. And in about six or eight weeks it takes for these things to come up. You chose as a developer to go that way. You weren't mandated. It hasn't happened for a while, (inaudible) mandatory pre-apps. Sure, I'd be okay getting rid of that, but the voluntary ones, developers see, the 33 of them this year. They see the value of this. I see value in it. Because once the application is in, as an area councillor, I can't have any input at that point. So, I'll say maybe you didn't know it. You've taken away the councillor's voice out of the whole process, including now pre-apps. Let alone the fact that we are going as of right. Which always takes our voice out of it. But again, now this pre-app, taken out of it, kills any chance the councillor will be able to have a vote because you are not allowed to speak about applications when they are submitted. So, I asked okay, so, Is it voluntary? Yes, it is, and you know what, that 610 dollars, that actually, if they decide to go through with it, that money is forwarded into the application. Very nice. Well, what else does it do? It puts all the information about their proposal in writing in one place for everybody to see. It brings continuity to multiple applications at the same time. Very good. On thing I thought it was pretty good, again, I know we don't want to make developers pay more, I got that. But again, there are tire kickers, this is a for-profit business. And there are tire kickers out there. This sorts out the tire kickers. We don't want all these people just calling Water and Waste Department, or Traffic and make our staff run around. We got to coordinate this a bit. And that is what this does. And then, so, set here for response. And anybody could have got, and the Committee should have got this, rather than having a walk on motion by councillor with no report. Maybe it should haven been referred back, maybe you want us to do that today. I am going to vote against it, obviously. Should report back to PP&D so a proper report can come forward. That would be a proper transparent way to do it. Not to say I heard from someone that they are upset so we should get rid of all of this. Well, to me, I don't have any substantial reason to agree to that. I've never seen any report on that. I do know the Director said six to eight weeks to get a pre-app done. I am trusting her, I don't see why not, I have seen no evidence otherwise. If there is some, show it to me. But I haven't seen any. So, again, I like the pre-app. I think that…so, one big question is, oh well, we got to get rid of pre-apps. All the voluntary pre-apps, and even the one in the process, get rid of them all, because this is why we can't develop more housing. So, the question I have to the administration was, does it slow down the process? Today we've heard that we have had meetings with the administration and they think so. No, they don't, they do not think so. There is no evidence for this. That is the response I got from the Administration. There is no evidence to support this. Again, this is what the letter says. I didn't write it. And I am not going to say who wrote it, but it was from senior Administration. So again, it may be valid. I don't think so. If it is so valid, show me some evidence, bring the report back for referral. So again, I won't be voting for a, b, or c. But you know, d is good, I can vote for d. So, I will be willing to do that. But I do believe we are missing a great opportunity with the pre-apps. They really do work well. And if someone wants to actually show me or have the Director have the ability to say so in a committee meeting that there is this huge issue that we have to...time sensitive issue that we need to get rid of pre-apps by not having a report, walking it on so they can have developers be able to talk to whatever department they want, kick the tires around in an uncoordinated fashion, and then…we don't want that. We know we don't want that. So, I don't see any evidence that this has slowed down the process. The information I have it doesn't slow down the process. It does speeds it up. A lot of that information...an application is very expensive. They want to talk about keeping developer's costs down, such as with the housing accelerator fund, that is fine, we'll talk about that later on. But again, this actually saves developer's money.

Especially some of it, we are running out of land. Some of the land that we have available to us is pretty complicated land, (inaudible). So again, If I was a developer and they say okay, you now have to do the application, we need 50 thousand dollars. I prefer to know before I spend 50 thousand dollars. That for 600 dollars that I get, if I decide to go forward, that is a better value to me, deciding if I am going to go forward on a big application. So, I don't see the reason for this. I think it's actually negative for the development community, I think it is negative for councillors to know what is going on, to be part of the decision making or at least give them some guidance and say, you know, if you really want to go over there, I can tell you there is a big stone, such as, you know, that there it can be a problem. Some people forgot it, some of us have long memory so, everything was way back then. That's a valuable piece of the puzzle. Like I also believe the public having input in a pre-application is a good thing, so now the developer knows what he is up for. Maybe no one cares, maybe they really care about something, they can adjust their application accordingly. So again, same thing with an application, the developer cannot go out there and talk about it, they have to do this and say it there. So, again, if the Mayor wants to bring it up again and make it go through PP&D, and they have a report, and they have a little discussion, I don't know why, it's going to be summer, then September. That's not so bad, but then we would have actually the information, not that anecdotal thing that some developers just want to get rid of it. I know they want to get rid of mandatory. I don't really care about the mandatory. We haven't really done those a lot ever, that is fine. But these developers, they are voluntarily choosing to do this. So why are we taking it away? I don't know, but I don't agree with this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, next is Councillor Rollins followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Important discussion. And I want to note that if it ends up back at Property and Development that is a-okay to me. This was generated by Executive Policy Committee. I am supportive of it, because as Chair of Property and Development, I am focused on taking approaches to encourage development in the City of Winnipeg to address the housing crisis, the vacancy rates that we have. Or declining vacancy rates we have and to, you know, making sure that we are doing all we can to get that housing accelerator fund dollars and commitments out to work in tandem with the province, the federal government, indigenous governments, on housing. But this goes to timely and instructive engagement. This goes to our infrastructure readiness. And this goes to enhanced economic benefits for the city in getting that done quicker. So, streamlining the approval process for development applications not only addresses housing needs but it also boosts economic growth, is the argument I will continue to make. But what is really important to address is that, you know, other cities do this, but they take two weeks. Our City unfortunately has been taking six to eight weeks, and that's after waiting a month to get this going. So, it does take time, it does not save money, it adds to the inflationary construction costs that everyone has experienced, whether you are not-for-profit housing developer or you are a bunch of advocates and lobbyists that have asked the City to really look critically at some of the things and practices that we have had. I want to say this though about the department. Every month as Chair, I get a Chair briefing. And every month as Chair, I say are there applications stuck? And sometimes there are, and sometimes as Chair, I have to do a hearing, like I had when a Canadian Tire was stuck. And sometimes that has nothing to do with the department. But it has to do with the activities as a Council. And so, what I will say, Madam Speaker, is that there are, you know, there are priorities that do come up through Property and Development. And I think I've made it clear my focus of three bites of the apple. And for sure, we need to look at permits and expediting those, we also need to look at the human resources required to do that once we have a business model we can all get behind as Council, because routinely, we are not necessarily staffing it commeasure it with other Canadian cities of our size, let alone our pop. But streamlining approaches are essential to really quickly bringing about more housing units. Everyone, I think, is clear that that's my focus as Chair, that is my advice to this Council, at the Standing Policy Committee Chair. And that we are alleviating the pressures that we are facing, is key. I think these are the reasons why I am supportive of this motion. I absolutely agree, infrastructure readiness is key. And that's why this month is probably a critical month for Winnipeggers to engage with respect to that, and no one is going to be out there more, I know, than my colleague Janice Lukes, in discussing that, because she and I, with OurWinnipeg, helped pen last term on strategic infrastructure. And so, in part and parcel, you need to know where your infrastructure is, where your capacity is. And so, I appreciate people's discussion with respect to utility of pre-applications. There is nothing, nothing stopping developers from still informally doing this. And I that is critical. There is nothing stopping, but what we have to do and what I think is my first challenge and it's an important day, I think, to state this before we, you know, discuss some of the motions that are coming up forward. For instance, Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Dobson's impact fee debate is to really focus on what we need to do first in the city. And I will reiterate as I have publicly before, the infrastructure readiness, strategic infrastructure is the plan and priority. And new housing developments without delays, without uncertainty. And that is the point of this motion, it to eliminate some of that, a pre-app that isn't necessary, they can still be done if developers want to with something informal that would still work and, but without delay. Without uncertainty. I hope people vote for the motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, good comments on this. I think that this should be referred back. I refer this back. I move a motion to refer this back to the Standing Committee, to hash this out some more, there's been some good debate, some insight from our fellow Councillors here with good experience, pro-development Councillors too, who we are trying

to explain that this is actually part of the streamlining process, at Property Planning and Development. You know, we don't have the same budgets as other cities, and therefore, my fear, I get that squeezy feeling therefore, because we don't have the staff therefore just…deregulate. But this isn't streamlining, in this case it is the impression that I am getting from fellow Councillors, and I wish that to have greater consideration and thus referral back to Standing Committee.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor do you wish to address?

Mayor Gillingham: Specifically, to that, I would prefer to vote on this matter today and not refer back.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. I'll call question on the referral back to the Property and Development Committee this item. All in favour? Contrary? We will have a recorded vote. All in favor please rise. All in favour of the referral back to Property Committee please rise.

Councillor Santos: Can I ask...No, no. I am asking the question for clarity. Because it came from EPC how do you refer it back to PP&D?

Madam Speaker: Your referral was back to the Property Committee. Is that in order, Mr. Clerk? Yes, that was the Committee of jurisdiction where the item started. So, that is in order. Ok? All in favor, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie absent. Thank you. The item is…pardon me. The motion to refer is lost. Let's continue debate. Councillor Gilroy you had your hand up?

Councillor Gilroy: I just, sorry, yeah, I was going to refer it back, Madam Speaker. But however, I know that the vote has been lost. I guess just…I do think that having a report on this isn't necessarily a bad thing. I could see where in some cases, I guess, I have questions, on why it is slowing it down, if it's six weeks. I would like to understand why that is. If there is any way to tighten that up. I think those would be my questions, that I have. Also too, I could see it maybe not being warranted for maybe infill projects and stuff. But, maybe more warranted for more of the green fill projects, more of those larger development projects. So, I guess I would want a little bit more of a greater understanding. You know, like if we are looking at, you know, new areas like the Kapyong barracks I would want to make sure we had all eyes on this from all different department levels. But of course, if it is house going up on Dominion Street in the West End, replacing another house I don't think we warrant it. So, I guess I would like a little bit more information before I make a final decision, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you to my colleagues for the debate. I think what is important here, is we want to get housing built, you know, as quickly as possible, reducing the red tape, where there is red tape. At times my understanding, the information that has come to me is that several times those pre-applications have been a requirement by the department. And that can take time. Not only can it take time for the developers, but it takes considerable time for our staff as well to go back and forth with those that are making application. Under the provincial regulations right now, provincial I think it's bill 37 from an application being submitted, not a pre-app, an application actually being submitted until a hearing is concluded, is a 150-day timeline. We have indication that there has been times when the pre-application has taken three months, 90 days. That means that, and the clock starts once a formal application is in, that means that we are looking at, in a case like that, eight months, or eight months plus, for something to make its way through our processes. And so, we want to make sure that we can get housing built as quickly as possible. I think that Councillor Rollins said it really well, she has given really good leadership to that file, this is one way to ensure that when our staff are doing their work, they are doing…they can be freed up to do work on the application itself, once it is in its

formal process. And we can get housing built, done faster, and get developments through the pipeline quicker. And so, I am asking for everyone's support on this motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on this item. All in favor please rise.

(inaudible)

Madam Speaker: I'm just pulling it up here, electronically. The clauses Mr. Clerk, if you can get to it first.

City Clerk: Yes. So, there's two recommendations. So, you can vote on recommendation one and two separately.

Madam Speaker: No. We can vote on one and two separately, is that your request? No. okay. We will vote on the item as a whole. All in favor please rise.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, I don't understand how we can't separate them by letters. One and two is not a division because number two is nearly that all things are to be done…

Madam Speaker: We've never voted sub clause. It is always just being the whole clause. That has been the practice in this Council. So, all in favor of this item, please rise.

(inaudible)

Madam Speaker: We are standing up; I think we are doing the vote now.

Councillor Allard: (inaudible) I mean, I don't mind voting for this, but I don't want to (inaudible)

Madam Speaker: I am sorry, did you say we can vote clause by clause? Okay, you'd said one and two, though.

City Clerk: There are two clauses, so it's one a, b, c, and d. So, a, b, c, and d are part of clause number one.

Madam Speaker: Right, are we voting a, b, and c, separately?

City Clerk: No, we are voting on one and two separately.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so one and two...okay. We are not voting on separate clauses, because Councillor Wyatt rescinded his request. So, it's just the one item. I've called the question. All in favor? That's right, and that's why we are voting on the one together. Okay so we are voting on entire item. Ladies, if you can take your seats, you have to be in your seat to be counted. All in favor please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Chambers, Eadie, Gilroy, Orlikow, Schreyer and Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays six

Madam Speaker: Item 12 passes. Onto the next item, Madam Clerk.

Item 13 - Removal of Traffic Study Requirement for Development Applications

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, I will wait to hear from my colleagues on this one.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, then Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I get the feeling that these are changes being made that really should be looked at when we are hearing all the recommendations, as Council as a whole. Because, regarding these two things, because all I can see is these are things to speed up a commitment by the Mayor for malls and corridors. Madam Speaker, the size of projects that they are talking about in here. Whether it's zone, they got mixed or just 20-unit complex plus, no traffic report. And then it says, oh but the developer can volunteer to put together a traffic study that they pay for which they are not going to tell you, Madam Speaker. Because it if it points out something bad and they still want to make your project then it has to work because x number of units is how it becomes profitable. Like, you know, I didn't see any traffic study associated with one we just passed near, Des Meurons and Mary, where you're putting in 104 housing units in residential streets where, guess what? Private school. How much traffic does that bring from all over Winnipeg? No, you haven't been driving to school, yeah, okay, sure. Taking a bus in the winter, oh yeah, sure, sure. Traffic studies are needed. And as a matter of fact, we should require parking studies too, because that same development that I am talking about there is no parking study, but already the multi-family that is in there is illegally taking the parking spots in business' parking lots, because their own home doesn't provide enough parking. Now, I go back to traffic. Now, it might make sense. You got a 120 something unit wanting to be built on Main Street and its access is going to be off of a major collector and through a back lane, so not bringing a bunch of traffic onto the residential streets behind it. I could see the city saying, well, we'll waive the need for a traffic study. Because we know that Main Street, we know that Main Street is the highway, and it's really busy. So, you know, that's one thing. However, I am going to use an example, Council just passed, last year, or whatever…we passed a development that I think they did a pre-app, or they tried to. Yes, I think that was a pre-app. Anyway, at North Gate mall. Now, the housing development made sense. They originally wanted though way too many units. But they needed to provide a traffic study, because while the driveway to the main building into these multi-family housing units is off McPhillips. You can also use the residential streets in behind it. So, to say that you are going to carte blanche no traffic study and you got like what? Maybe I think there was about 180 something units, maybe a little bit less, but still, a lot of new automobile traffic. Not everybody is going to be living without a car, yeah, they're offering car share, or, you know, or share a car or whatever. Now, you mean, that's good, that's convenient. But the reality is, there's still going to be a lot of motor vehicles associated with that development and the traffic study was done. And what did we find out? We found out, well we had to make one street a one-way. That was what traffic study brought, very important. To say you don't need it, because you want to make things go faster. Well, bring in a bunch of cars, they will go faster, sure they will, on residential streets, where it looks like everybody is speeding. But anyway, I digress. Traffic studies should be required. Especially in some situations. But, you know, it is always good to have the traffic study, and you know, we should demand to do it. We don't have enough staffing to do all the developments or whatever, which will probably be one of the reasons for getting rid of this delay. I don't know if, you know, if there is another city that doesn't require traffic studies, I don't know, is that Toronto? Well, it doesn't matter what you build in Toronto now, there is always traffic problems, it doesn't matter. But Winnipeg is quite different, Winnipeg is not Toronto. We can't even, you know, look at building a Chief Peguis extension and charging a toll, making it a proper trade corridor, because there is not enough traffic. So, Madam Speaker, this is a bad idea. The people who are going to have to live with these developments in their neighborhood deserve to have a traffic study. And taking this away is bad business. I'm voting against it.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, Madam Speaker, I am reading the motion, and I am doing a kick out of it. In the whereas clause it says City of Vancouver is expediting development applications by removing the need to submit traffic studies, as a condition for accepting a development application. There is no more land left in Vancouver, Madam Speaker. If anybody knows Vancouver for the last 30 years. The only land they have is for the redevelopment of existing sites. They don't have what we still have. Which is the way this resolution reads somebody could come forward on a, I don't know, 20, 30, 40-acre site, as long as they make this a mixed-use development where the predominant form includes 20 or more residential units in a single structure. So, you've just wiped out the requirement for a traffic study on a massive development saying that we basically tied the hands of the department of Public Works. I'm not sure if they are going to be happy about this, considering that, probably the city of Vancouver does a better job when it comes to their traffic studies, and well, they have a far bigger transportation system than us with alternatives, such as sky train and everything else. But to wipe out the requirement on a massive residential mixed-use development for a traffic study? Is the public policy now of the city being written by the Urban Development Institute? Is that who is writing it? Is that who is directing our public policy? Might as well call a spade a spade, Madam Speaker, because that is the way it reads to me. UDI is running public policy of the City now. And now I am a former member, you know? I know what they asked for. They will love this. Because they really don't care if people get to and from their developments, ultimately, as long as it gets sold. And the long-term transportation needs…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, that last statement would you like to retract that?

Councillor Wyatt: Well, I don't know what I said wrong.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I'd be happy to give my colleague a point of order, happy to explain when you call into question a company's motive…

Councillor Wyatt: I will retract the statement. This is an organization not a company, but I will retract this. I've got to give them credit for doing a good job.

Councillor Rollins: (inaudible) who want to create a livable city, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: We need to watch when we insinuate motive, and your have retracted your statement.

Councillor Wyatt: Well, I have retracted it. I wonder if they are registered on voluntary lobbyist registry, I would be curious to know. But you know? Good public policy does sometimes require transportation studies when you are doing a larger development. And believe it or not, even mid-size developments. I can speak to an item. I actually can't, because it is still before public hearing. Where transportation study was done that informed our Public Works department of information, they were not aware of. And they appreciated it. and now we are actually using it to inform a capital project that is significant. Are we approved by this Council and the timing was good. And so, I just think this is again, similar to the previous motion, this is a race to look like, make us look like you are doing something without doing it, other than eliminating an entire department's ability for due diligence, which by the way, Madam Speaker, doesn't hold anything up. You can walk and chew gum at the same time. So, the minute that an application… What do I mean by that? In the minute that the application is made, and department is processing it, Planning, Property and Development, the traffic study could have been done in advance prior to the application being made. The traffic study could be done while the application is being processed in time for the hearing. The matter of fact is that transportation and traffic study can actually be done during process, yes it can, during the process of the hearing. We had that too. And it has come forward to the hearing, I disagree, I remember the Mayor staff up on the galley. But Madam Speaker, to eliminate this, seems to me we might be cutting our nose off to spite our face. I am all in favour of bringing a motion forward, second by Councillor Orlikow that would actually address the issue that the development and business community and others are expressing concern about process. And we set the benchmarks to that motion; we will get things moving in the city and the Planning Department. But this stuff, this is actually going to hurt us in the long run, not help us. Thank you.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wanted to, through this chamber running this. I think it is a positive step. Other jurisdictions such as the State of California have eliminated, not only eliminated the need for traffic studies. Madam Speaker, through you to the chamber but also change the metric involved, in whether or not developments should be approved with a metric called vehicle kilometers travel. The idea there being that what is important isn't how long you wait at intersections which is really what traffic studies are about. And I can tell everyone today what a traffic study can say on every single development. It will impact the levels of service at an intersection. Because we are adding units to the number of units that exists in the City of Winnipeg. Presumably that also means increases in population. Therefore, if the same number of people continue the same number of private automobile trips, the levels of service at intersections diminishes. So, we already know the answer to traffic studies, whether of not we want to keep paying for traffic studies that confirm that levels of service at controlled intersections will diminish. I think that is money badly spent. If we wanted to be progressive and do things like the State of California has imposed on its various municipal regional governments then that will be a step even further in the right direction. I've had asked the Public Service to include that; Council did through the Committee. I am not sure if that's in the Transportation Master Plan, but the concept of induced demand, private vehicle kilometers traveled. I think those are the metrics we need to look at, not traffic studies because we already know what they are going to say. And if we want to see a city infill develop traffic studies will almost certainly give us a nod in the direction of not approving more infill and densifications. So that is why I will be supporting this motion. Thanks.

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

Councillor Lukes: I just want to read this. It's not saying no traffic study, it is saying that the Public Service be directed to accept development applications without requiring the completion of a traffic study. So, lots of times what happens is, they won't accept the development application until the traffic study is completed. It is not saying no, don't do a traffic study…right? It's saying, take the application, start your process of going through the application, let them continue beavering away on their traffic study, but don't work away on their traffic study. But, you know, do the traffic study but you can put your application in, but continue your traffic study. And they can...it's like simultaneously trying to speed up the two processes at the same time. So, it is not saying no traffic study at all for multi-residential developments or mixed-use developments. It is saying take the application, let them continue on with the completion of traffic study for these types. I hope that clarifies it. Maybe the Chair of PP&D can clarify it further.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: So, I won't belabour the points that I made in the previous item, Madam Speaker, that is to say though, we have a lot of examples of the cities that have done this, the concurrent point that Councillor Lukes made can't be stated probably clear enough. These things can happen concurrently. It does not eliminate it. I spent a lot of time in part with her department explaining the intention, because elimination isn't elimination in this case. It's just making sure that things can move forward in expeditious manner. And really good points by my colleagues, I hope that there is unanimity in this vote. Given the level of comfort people should have, that traffic studies can still go forward. It's just not going to prevent, you know, the permits being held up.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor over to you...Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much! Again, it would be really nice to have the opportunity to speak to this matter at the proper Standing Policy Committee. But again, it's now a walk on. So, we didn't have opportunity. So, what we are hearing today it doesn't prevent the traffic study. That's what we've been told. I think everybody is pretty clear on that, I thank Councillor Lukes for addressing it. What do you mean by that? If you don't have traffic study as part of an application, how do you get a traffic study? Well, you can get one, but after we approve it. Because that's what it says, maybe I'm wrong, and it's called debate time. Nor would prevent the Public Service from requesting the traffic study to mitigate the intention of the developer. Intention in the developer approval process. So, again, we have a public hearing, right? The committee goes, hey, you know what I would like to have in a public hearing? I would like to have a traffic study. Well, that's great, but, as we have Councillor Wyatt, we can't wait that long, so now they are going to do a traffic study in 30-days, that is what the plan is, or is it too late, because we already approved the rezoning. I don't know. Is it going to be a Variance, is it going to be a Conditional Use? I don't know.
So, that I am not too sure about. I'm not sure how you could do a traffic study after the fact. Because sometimes it is pretty critical. The other part of traffic studies that aren't so bad and I have had one incident where the Public Works department goes, yes, this will kind of work, but we are going to have this and this and this on the street. And they go, how much does that going to cost? And who is going to pay for that? Well, the developer will have to pay for that once it rolls out at a certain point, (inaudible) criteria, and bla bla bla, right? So, I am not sure how that that fits into it. Again, this actually has some merit, possibly, but also, I know the other side of the coin. Because residents are not going to be pleased if a big mall gets transformed into this big development with all residential and, there is no traffic study. Because there just isn't. I guess we can request one. I guess the public hearing body could. So, I understand and I do think Councillor Lukes should have provided the only, so far, the Councillor Rollins did a little bit as well but gave me a little more light on this. And that's why we go to Committee. That's why we let everybody have a chance to hear what we are saying and why this came forward. Not walk-ons. (inaudible) Yeah, that was it? And then I go, no more debate? Councillor Mayes made a few comments. I appreciate that there, and there was no more debate. I mean, no more discussion, no report, no nothing. So, I don't really know, because I do know that traffic studies are important. So, my first red flag is, no way, we need those. However, there is a gap where we could, maybe it is, and when the application is received, they go, now we want a traffic study. Well, who suggests that? Public Works department? Because we don't have a chance to do that. We are not in charge of the application at all. So then, the councillors want to do that? They have to do it at a public hearing. You are already in a public hearing. What happens if that traffic study gets back really bad, can you go back unzone it? No, we can't, the public hearing is closed, no new information after that is over. So, traffic study, I'm not sure I can provide new information after the public hearing is closed. So, I do…what I'm really trying to stress is, talk to us. Let us have the opportunity to know why you are thinking this. Don't just walk it in, and then say, we are going to do the away with traffic studies, not really, kind of, maybe, ish. Come on, give us a little more respect than that. This is…everybody has to know this is sensitive issue, this is a big issue. Is it time sensitive? It can wait until September. No one is going to…oh yes, we can't wait two months for this sensitive issue because we have to make sure all of the housing going down is super fast. Well, again, I got it. I understand the ideology and the mindset, but again, a little bit of information would be much better and an opportunity to actually be able to ask questions. And to debate it, or not even debate it, just be able to come forward. And so, you will say, why you didn't come and tell me first? Well, I didn't make the motion. People will…I say though a lot of information go to Councillor, because I can put a motion forward. It is my job to try to educate you why I did this. Now I get this motion here, you don't have to fight what I say, but I can try to help you to understand where I am coming from. This I get this, I am not sure where that as whereas last part means, not sure how it works out. But so today I am sitting here going, okay, I can vote with the Mayor and EPC, who were all supportive of it. So, they will approve, maybe they won't get so mad at me later on in the future. Or I have to say, you know what, the process here was really wrong and in this in even how we are addressing this issue. So, I am going to stand up today and I am going to put my foot down to say this stuff is...the way that you are doing this is not acceptable, as a Council as for Council as a whole. If you really want to bring councillors on board and let us understand where you are coming from. Go through the Committee process or reach out to everybody to talk about it. I got one reach out last night from the Mayor's Office, and it wasn't about this. It wasn't about anything else; it was about they really want me to vote a certain way, on a certain issue. Fair enough, they are allowed to do that, I don't mind that at all. I appreciate that, it wasn't about my motion. No, it was about something they had on their little...on their table, up top, that was important. But again, a little respect. A little respect for Councillors who aren't on this, I've been on both sides. And I definitely, I do apologize that when I was on EPC, I kind of, good, we had a chance, I am sure all members, we had a nice long meeting on one time or whatever. We discussed with

Mayor about this. Internally, that's great, I am sure you did, I know I am not sure you did, because I am not privy to those meetings, but we weren't privy to it. So, it would be really nice to be able to have the opportunity, to be able to have the information. It would be nice. So, now I'm stuck with I'm not too sure, maybe, possibly, where do I go? And I will let you know in a minute.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, followed by Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Mayes: Briefly, I take comfort from one thing in here, which is in the motion approved at EPC, and this is probably what I said at EPC whereas removing the completion of one or more traffic studies as a precondition for accepting development applications would not prevent the City Council from requiring traffic studies as a mitigation measure as a condition of approval. So, we are going to have bucket two and a half come here at some point with the malls and corridors, I would strongly recommend that we not waive traffic studies if you are the Councillor for St. Vital centre area and you know that people want to build large developments there. There should be a traffic study. It will have an enormous impact on the neighbouring neighbourhoods and on the residents nearby. You might say no; we need that number of count, we need that number of unit count up. Density at any cost. And if that's the philosophy, I guess that's the philosophy. It should apply in all wards and in all situations. But hopefully we take a slightly more measured view than that, so hopefully when we get bucket two and a half, malls and corridors here before us, we say yes, there should be traffic studies requirement once the development is over, a certain amount. You probably don't need a traffic study if you are building a three-storey addition on St. Mary's Road, but you sure as hell need a traffic study if you are going to massively develop some of the major mall parking lots. I think that's the intent of that paragraph, though I am not the author. But I would certainly say if this passes today, that the inclusion of that wording gave me some comfort before EPC. So, I certainly hope...when are we on 2.5, I think we are in December? So many different buckets, so many different procedures here. So, we probably don't need the traffic study as part of the fourplexes everywhere, which is just what everyone voted for, and what people are now saying well of course there are exceptions, it shouldn't apply in my ward and certain areas. Interesting, that debate is yet to come. But surely on the malls and corridors we need this take this into consideration.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I will not be supporting this. This is…this is, I really disagree with this one. This is a big one for me. All I can think about was the mall in your area, Madam Speaker, that got a big redevelopment, and things really had to change. And all I have in my vision of this is looking at Polo Park and Empress with two lanes. I don't know how we are going to manage the traffic with the development that may be happening there. And I sure would want to know early on how we are going to manage that. We are widening roads in other places, we're putting money in other places, and we are not even looking at some of the developments that are going to be coming down the line. And it's really going to need investments, and maybe even taking away, expropriating property, or building wider roads to make sure we can deal with the capacity of development that might be happening. So, I would want to ensure that we are doing our due diligence and making sure that we are ahead of the game. And I think that that is a major goal in here, at the City of Winnipeg, when we are looking at development I am all for looking for ways to streamline the processes and policies around our development. I think that we shall be looking for it, I am a proponent of getting more infill and more housing. But I also know that we have a real obligation for all Winnipeggers to ensure that when we are building, we are building it right and doing it properly. And if we are not managing the traffic pole in our city from the get-go, Madam Speaker. This would fall on us. This is our role and our obligation. And I look at, what is going around Polo Park, as a prime example. There is not too many ways in and out of that area, Madam Speaker. And you had to deal with that development in your neck of the woods, too. And you did a very good job navigating that, but I can't imagine us not able to have a strategy around the flow of traffic at the beginning of the process, Madam Speaker, And so. that is our role and responsibility as councillors. And so, maybe there was a more dialogue, I again, Madam Speaker, I am not on EPC, so I don't have that information, and just as Councillor Lukes has chimed in many times and says I was very unvocal, when I was on EPC. Now she is very unvocal because she is on EPC. So, things don't change much, but anyways, we are all in good fun. That is the way the world works. But I do really believe that this is a strong role that we must take at the City, and I know we are looking at adding more developments, but my gosh, if we take, or, if we start really not looking at our key obligations at making sure, we are managing our city. I have a lot of fear in that, as a Councillor. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to read the motion, or paraphrase it, that should we accept development applications without requiring the completion of traffic study for multi-residential development with 20 or more units in a single structure and mixed-use development in which the predominant build form includes 20 or more residential units. So, if we don't need traffic study for that, when would we need a traffic study? When we are pulling in a neighbourhood? Well, yeah, of course. So, why did our predecessors bring in traffic studies in the first place? Are they irrelevant? Well, we just heard in this Council chamber, not that we really had a chance to dispute it, but commuting times are only increasing. Well, actually, that is a nature of urbanization. You know, I guess that's the case, so we are trying to

streamline things all the way around. Isn't a traffic study practical, and that? Isn't that why we have them in the first place? Especially when we are having 20 or more units being developed. Isn't that the point of a traffic study in the first place? Are they irrelevant? I don't think so. One, we are talking about increasing commuting time, so, you know, we should think about these things. That is our job. When it comes to the less and less responsibility that Council has over development but having said that, if we are so for streamlining the process. If we get rid of this, then we have to ask for them. And when we ask for them during the hearing process that slows down the process. So, if we want to streamline this process why wait until we already have our hearings thus bogging down the process? When we have developments over 20 units at a time, I think that is a good time to sort of streamline process already happening as part of the process and not wait. Because if you wait, it bogs things down. Isn't the reason we just had some of these other changes in the By-laws in the name of streamlining, Planning, Property and Development? I don't think getting rid of this streamlines anything, quite frankly. It might in some respect, but not really when it comes to the job that city hall has to do. And I just dread the day that we ask for a traffic study and then we are accused of slowing the process down. Let's not have that happen. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I want to thank everyone for their comments. I want to thank Councillors Lukes and Rollins and Mayes for bringing some clarity to this. I want to remind everyone, encourage my colleagues, Madam Speaker, to read the last whereas clause which has been cited by a couple of my colleagues. We are not eliminating traffic studies. But we are eliminating traffic studies as a precondition for accepting development applications. And I won't reread the whereas clause, but the whereas clause, I think, you know, certainly spells out that Council, our own staff, and others could require and request a traffic study as part of the development process. Through you Madam Speaker, I want to address comments of Councillor Orlikow. And I am sympathetic to what he says in many ways. And I could have, and certainly, should have in this case probably sent an e-mail of this to all of Council; to give councillors a better understanding and heads up and that's on me. And certainly, though when I did post the (inaudible) welcome in any calls or questions about clarity on that. But I want to remind all of my colleagues. Every Councillor has a Community Committee they sit on where they can bring forward motions. Every Councillor sits on one or more Standing Committees where they can bring forward motions. Our structure is such that the Mayor has one committee where the Mayor has an opportunity to bring forward motions of policy. And that is EPC. So, it is not…when the motion comes from me as Mayor or anyone at EPC, I would say it is not springing a motion on all of Council. Because there is timelines between EPC and Council. I certainly, as Mayor, can tell you for sure, I don't know if every motion that is coming through Community Committee or from Community Committee. Often, I see motions as Mayor, they come out of Standing Committee and then after the fact that no one has told me about...and that's...I mean, it would have been ideal to have everybody share motions with everybody ahead of time? Of course. But that is not what happened as the case may be. But I do note that on this one I don't think Councillor Orlikow was out of line to request, you know, neither was all of you get an opportunity for me to circulate a motion, I will try to do that in the future. But specific to this, this is again, we are not saying we are completely doing away with traffic studies. But this says they no longer are a precondition to accepting a development application. And I think that is important as an effort to speed up, once again, to speed up development and not have those applications delayed. But I ask everyone to vote to support this motion please. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that I'll call the question. There's been call for a recorded vote. All in favor please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gilroy, Schreyer and Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays four

Madam Speaker: The item carries. Next item. Madam Clerk.

Item 14 - Downtown Capital Arts Grant

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor your opportunity to introduce the item.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I want to thank colleagues for the support on this. I think most, if not all, of my colleagues are supporting this. This really is part of…a portion of the budget that was adopted where we were, as a Council, going to provide over the arch of the next four years of the 2 million dollars in capital grants for downtown arts groups specific to you know, them meeting some of the requirements. What this does really is it allows the application timeline to be open and be extended really to September 30th. We didn't get the application time opened like we had wanted to. So, this just provides an extension. So, we can make sure that those arts organizations who do just outstanding work, can access these funds and make an application to get the support that Council is providing. And that was part of a campaign that I made to provide arts organizations with access to capital funds. So, I am asking for everyone's support on this motion. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Oh no, sorry.

Madam Speaker: Ok, any other…Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I am supportive, perhaps the CAO, acting CAO, interim CAO, I think interim CAO could clarify for us when the starting gate will open on this. We have been trying to get. We had to move the completion date to apply, but we haven't yet opened. So, I don't know if that is fair to ask our interim CAO or not. But I have been saying next week to people for a number of weeks. And I am hoping to get this open, I support the program, I support the Mayor's initiative. I'd just…I hoped we would be having an intake process. Because we have the end of the intake process specified, then we would be able to have the start date (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes, is that a time sensitive question of clarification? Or…do you want to…

Councillor Mayes: Yes. I think…well…there has to be a starting line here at some point. I just would like some guidance on that.

Madam Speaker: Right now, there is an extension of the application date, yes.

Councillor Mayes: There's an extension of the completion date, but what we don't have is a start date.

Madam Speaker: Sure, If Mr. CAO, if you can please come to the podium.

Interim CAO: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to Councillor Mayes, I just want to thank you for the question. And I do have a meeting next week. My office is in communication with the Mayor's Office, we are working on this as a top priority, and we do expect that there will be application process and we'll be able to do that within the coming week or two.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Mayes: You've been in the office eight days, and still. Yeah, no. That's great. (laughter) Let's get this thing started.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker. Any questions? No further speakers. Mr. Mayor over to you to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Call the question, please Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Ok, All in favor, Item 14? Contrary? That's carried. Item 15.

Item 15 - Vacant Buildings Fee Structure

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to take this opportunity to thank Superintendent Dave Dalal of the Winnipeg Police Service, the Fire Paramedic Chief Christian Schmidt, Kelly Happychuk of Public Works and Winston Yee of our By-Laws Enforcement. And I want to thank all of my Council colleagues, who over the years have been trying to...have been bringing forward motions and initiatives. I worked on as a Council member, as a Councillor, and now as a Mayor. So many of us have been putting effort into addressing the issue of vacant and derelict buildings, Madam Speaker. But specifically, I thank those four members of our Public Service, because recently I had a meeting with them, to asked ask them what more do they see that we can to out as the Council, to reduce the numbers of fires in vacant and derelict

buildings. And one of the things I think that we have to bear in mind, I really, I think the real issue when it comes to vacant and derelict buildings. Yes, there's light, yes there is the danger of fire, yes there is criminal activity, yes that's part of the trouble, but that the heart of the issue is that these properties are not developed into the highest best use. These sites should be where residents are living. There sites should be where commercial activity is taking place. They shouldn't be boarded up. One of the things that came out of my meeting with the four members of the Public Service was the request that they had that we move to the enhanced boarding requirements as the standard for boarding. The police and fire reps indicated that where there is enhanced boarding it has reduced the number of times people can break into those buildings, because it makes it much harder to get into the building and therefore reduces the possibility of fire. And so, I think this is a step that we can take. We have to have a change I think in By-law here. So, by bringing this forward politically asking our staff to make this change we believe this is one more thing that we will have a positive impact on the challenge that we are having with vacant and derelict buildings. We all agree, we have too many in the city. As I said one moment ago, you know, to this Harvard...Bloomberg Harvard initiative that mayors get access to. And I am kind of bringing all of us in, you know, as a Council and (inaudible) a city in this meeting this week. And I wish everybody, all 16 of us were sitting in this room today. But the goal is to bring those resources, those ideas to bear, to add to the work that we are doing. And that is why addressing vacant and derelict buildings is the number one goal when it comes to this initiative that I, and by extension, all of us are all part of, through Bloomberg Harvard. And so, this will be more than we do over the coming year to address it in a greater way. But what we have before us today is by moving to enhanced boarding as the standard for boarding. It will further reduce the likelihood that somebody or anybody can break into any building that is boarded up. And so, I do ask for your support on this.

Madam Speaker Thank you, first speaker, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Besides the more stringent boarding, I believe this talks about the increase in fees as well, Madam Speaker. Anyway, I will be supporting this motion. But I need to speak to this. I heard a community person from the Spence neighborhood on the news, when this was and I believe this was also a walk on I think, I'm not sure. Although it was reported in the media that it was coming. And I think it is important, but Madam Speaker, the woman from the Spence neighborhood accurately pointed out this isn't going to resolve the issue. This is going to improve and slow down any fires. They are still going to be vacant. And there is a whole bunch of underlying reasons, Madam Speaker. The William Whyte neighborhood, there is 110 of which, I think 40 have burned...or more now. But Madam Speaker, these many various underlying problems, which I talked to the CAO about, and mentioned to the former CAO three years ago or more, when we were working on this issue, and actually the CAO was at the, supposedly at the forefront of that. We are not going to get the best use, unless and I'm glad that everybody voted to refer the neighborhood revitalization motion from Councillor Gilroy, because that is going to give us the ability to deal with the underlying problems. Some problems are you can't get enough...a vacant house. I don't have enough money to renovate it. And then, eventually, maybe I am too old or, I can't renovate it, and it is not liveable. So, I am not living in that house anymore. And I don't have the wherewithal, or there is an initial fire, and the house becomes vacant, because you didn't have insurance, Madam Speaker, or whatever. We have the Duffer neighborhood with lots of these properties as well. Now, we will increase the fees and a lot these properties we end up with owning, but we have to do it through the tax sale. Which, as we you all know is basically a five-year process. Sometimes you can't find the owner of the property or even a relative because nobody wants to be associated with the house, because they inherited it. They don't have money to fix it up. They can't rent it out, Madam Speaker, until they renovate it. And they can't even get rents high enough because in these neighborhoods we have our societal issues. Which we are trying to address ourselves and we are trying to get province to address as well. But Madam Speaker, this is just another patch job initiative that has never led to our getting rid of vacant derelict buildings. We had pretty well as many back in 1998 and 1999 as we do today. And guess what? It is actually a lot of the same neighborhoods. So, we need some initiatives, which we can do through revitalizations, having money, I mean, Councillor Santos and Councillor Gilroy tried to get 3 million dollars in the budget, so we could at least have money in our budget to clean that off. When you can't find the owner and the owner just abandoned the property, or whatever. So, you know, that is what we need to be talking about. We referred it back to EPC, and I would appreciate the invitation, Mr. Mayor, to have a discussion why...like downtown is getting a lot of money pumped into it now. There's lot of private sector moving ahead. The problem is the neighborhoods around downtown are actually in worse condition. So, we need to cover the ring around the center called downtown and we need to deal with it, Madam Speaker. So, I will be voting for this recommendation. I think it is fine. But don't fool yourself, this is not good. This is not getting the best use; it's not getting rid of vacant derelict housing. Until we find enough money to help private people or make a lot of it public...whatever. Until we actually, put some investment into neighborhood revitalization that invests money to ensure, like what is the value of the properties in William Whyte now? It's way down. So, there you go, you know. The higher the value, the more taxes you pay, right? Anyway, it is a good thing. So, it is in our interest to have the best use as well. Take that in mind, we are going to end up with owning more of these properties with increased fees. Because a lot of these people don't have money. So, they won't be able to, when you put it on the property tax bill, they won't be able to pay it. So, what are you going to do, throw them in jail? I don't know, whatever. But the point I am just trying to make is just simply, this is just another band-aid, yeah, it will prevent more fires, I agree. But it doesn't resolve the vacant derelict housing problem. It really does not. We have been doing this kind of stuff since the 1990s. Doesn't seem to work. Thanks.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, through you. Councillor Eadie is right. Absolutely, this will not solve…to add the enhanced boarding as requirement as a standard boarding, those properties will still be vacant, will still be derelict sites. So, he is right on that. As is the, whoever it was the speaker from the Spence neighborhood. I think we are all sympathetic to my Council colleagues for whom their wards see the most of these vacant derelict buildings. I am sympathetic to Mr. Darrell Warren in the William Whyte neighborhood. And all of the people who live in these neighbourhoods. So that is why I am just to kind reiterate it before I close, that's why we are tackling the problem together, and utilizing the resources, external resources and ideas, whatever, that can be offered from Bloomberg Harvard initiative, and others needs to come to bear, because we really need to tackle this and drive these numbers down. So, I thank my colleagues for their ongoing commitment to this. Just one more step. It's not the solution but it's one more step. You call the question, Madam Speaker, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, I will call the question on item 15. All in favor? Contrary? That is carried. Councillor Wyatt absent. Next item.

Item 16 - Funding for Beliveau/Windsor Park Running Track

Madam Speaker: And there is an amending motion by Councillor Mayes and seconded by Councillor Allard, going with this. Mayor to introduce the item.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Mayes
Seconded by Councillor Allard

BE IT RESOLVED THAT that Item 16 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated July 9, 2024, be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendation 1.B and replace with the following:*

  "B. $86,878.44 from the St. Boniface Ward Land Dedication Reserve Fund."

Mayor Gillingham: Yeah, I will just hear from my colleagues, I am in supportive of the amending motion here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes to introduce the item and speak to the motion.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. This has been a difficult project, and it is far from over. The error I made was in assuming the City of Winnipeg could put in a replacement running track after about a 50-year gap in doing so because it has been just a nightmare to deal with this file. I feel there is some very fine people working on it from the City of Winnipeg trying their best, Danny Tooth, Brad Erickson, Jeff Patton, (inaudible), Interim CAO has been dragged into this one, the Mayor's Office. So, the running track strategy which we have had in recent years, we've been able to do a number of tracks around the city, we are proud of that. First one was in my ward, and then it got dangerous, because I started advocating for other people's wards, and no one knew how to review that. So, Madam Speaker we did Garden City, along with the school division, Councillor Browaty and Councillor Chambers and I got through River East project. The Nelson Mac one opened last month, funded through one of my accounts, with Councillor Allard's support. Grant Park in the ground now, 1.4 million dollars. A Orlikow-Mayes production with some money left over from previous budgets. And then this one, which has been a real challenge. I am using some federal money and as a result that meant that the city had to deliver this project which is on school division land, so far we have federal money, we have provincial money, we have school division money, we have money now from both Councillor Allard and myself, unfortunately the bids that came in for this project were well over the estimate. There was a fiery debate about how to deal with that. The city staff, to their credit, are not learning on, some of the internal costs that might otherwise do so, and in return Councillor Allard and I have found some money to get this thing approved. Should have been approved first week of July. These things are very time sensitive. And if they can't rubberize the tracks once the outdoor temperature goes below nine degrees at night. So, we are up against the clock here. It would be extremely frustrating for this to go another year. Remember we approved Grant Park money in March. School divisions got it being constructed now. It will be open by the fall, in like six months. This we announced more than a year ago. We still not in the ground. Hopefully next week we will be in the ground, but that hinges on getting the money approved today, so I appreciate the support of one and all, none of this is additional money out of the city budgets. I will be putting in some, Councillor Allard will to his great credit will be putting in some. We will have to work that out between us. Convoluted and complicated even further, that we have already put in some land dedication through delegated authority. So, we don't need further approvals or reports to do land dedication amounts. We do need approval to do the 100 thousand from the brand-new community incentive grant funding. Councillor Lukes is coming in, later this meeting

perhaps with a not dissimilar request to expend the CIG money in her ward. So, open to any questions, open to any discussion. It's stands certainly for the premise that we will never have the city do another one of these projects again, I suspect. Looking forward to doing one hopefully in Councillor Duncan or Councillor Dobson's ward and being done with this, because we do need to do one in the West End if we find the funding. So, that is perhaps is more than it is worth. But very proud of this project, it has not been easy. I have had a very good relation with LRSD, have to work on that a bit with some online traffic from one of the trustees. But I will deal with that. But for today my thanks to Councillor Allard for, it is in his Ward it is attracted...probably kids from my ward and kids from Councillor Wyatt's ward as well who go to Winter Park Collegiate, coming into (inaudible) area. So, Councillor Wyatt would like to, you know, cover any cost overruns that would be swell. We will talk. Alright. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next speaker, Councillor Orlikow, followed by Councillor Allard.

Councillor Orlikow: I will be a little cheeky here, I just want to point out. Isn't it great that we have LDR? Isn't it wonderful that we have LDR? We have spray pads, we get tracks, I have done a couple hundred thousand trees almost, I feel. Isn't that wonderful and I just want to thank Councillor Allard for saying it in his budget so we can put into this wonderful project through LDR.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think the Councillor of River Heights is probably out of order talking about a future possible debate. Perhaps, perhaps not. I want to take an opportunity to commend Councillor Mayes for bringing this project with what might be described as herculean effort. Mayes, Hercules, same same metaphor. Anyway, Madam Speaker, when somebody puts their mind to a project in this chamber, Councillor Mayes is one of the best at it. And despite what the Councillor has been describing as what is again, arduous process, I think it is an example of when Councillor Mayes decides to do something, he finds a way, and I just, where there is a will, there is a way. So, I want to thank Councillor Mayes, Madam Speaker, through you to the chamber, and to anyone watching that for deciding to build, deciding to become the patron of tracks in Winnipeg, and that one of those tracks, two of those tracks happen to be getting built the St. Boniface ward and the lion's share of the credit I would like to, in no uncertain terms, communicate is Councillor Mayes. So, thank you, Madam Chair. Through you to the Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to rise to acknowledge the efforts of Councillor Mayes who has dedicated himself in part to restoring some of the tracks around the city. I've had the opportunity to work with him on one of the tracks that I am alumni from Fort East Collegiate. And as we approach the Paris games…Olympic games in a matter of days now. I would like to extend the opportunity to work with Councillor Mayes again, I am looking at Fort Richmond Collegiate that needs a new track. When I was out there, just earlier this summer, and saw the amount of kids that were using that area playing basketball, you know, outdoors in their school field, that is literally what it is. It's literally just a field that has a gravel track around it that the weeds are growing through. So, I am extending the opportunity to go one more time around the track at Fort Richmond Collegiate and I am hoping that Councillor Mayes, would lend his expertise to providing valuable information and resources towards the development of a new rubberized track at Fort Richmond Collegiate. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah Madam Speaker, I would like to rise to say that...to respond to the challenge by Councillor Mayes and Councillor Allard, that I would be more than happy to move, you know, some money from the Transcona's share of LDR 10,000 dollars and deduct five and five accordingly, from each of your funds if you wish. I would need a seconder. But I would be more than happy to do that in light of what Councillor Mayes pointed out. It's your call.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes your opportunity to close on the motion.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, yes. Perhaps we can do that offline with Councillor Wyatt. That is very generous, there are some kids that go to that school. I knew that. This has been such a complicated process. Oh, the grants should go to the school. But no, now we have...the City as to internally apply for this funding. Who is giving the money? The City. It's like, well, MA has to write the application. So, we have Monica (inaudible) on this, so we are going to get this thing done yet. But I will take the money. But let's just approve this for today. Because it has just been so complicated. Without, anyway, we are hopefully in the ground next week, but yes, Councillor Wyatt and I hopefully we'll certainly have him there for the opening relay lap, hopefully this fall, not in some indefinite future year. But thank you for the support and the kind words from all, probably won't do Fort Richmond because of the money but, one in the west hopefully but yes, hopefully Councillor Wyatt will keep that thought and we will sort out something.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, you call the question then on the main item, please.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Okay, the amending motion first, or course. The amending motion one, all in favor? Contrary? Carried. The Main item as amended. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Councillor Eadie: Before we proceed to By-laws. I would like to stand up, and I don't know if that is a point of order or if I should declare myself in conflict. But I am aware that the will of Council on by-law 26/2024 that it should have been heard, the hearing should have been to Council as a whole. And given that I am of the knowledge that it probably is a violation, and it proceeded in an inappropriate fashion. So, I am either going to declare that I am in conflict with that because it should have been a hearing by Council according to the will under reports that we have passed some time ago. So, with the advice of the clerk or whatever, I don't want to vote on 26/2024. Because I believe it is not...I don't believe it is legal. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie you can be recorded in opposition, or you can certainly…right, but there is no abstaining from a vote. So, you can leave the chamber if you wish. Ok. Thank you for the notification. Motion six is next. Moved by Councillor Gilroy and Seconded by Councillor Allard, It's Regarding a Living Wage Framework. This will be an automatic referral to the Standing Committee.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Councillor Gilroy: Suspension of the rules, so we can hear it now, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy moves suspension of the rules to deal with item today. All in favor please rise. Living wage, it is another motion that has been circulated. And Councillor Gilroy is asking for suspension of the rules to deal with the item today. All in favor of suspension, please rise.

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

BE IT RESOLVED:

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

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

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

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

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

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

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Eadie, Gilroy, Schreyer, Wyatt.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: The suspension is lost. Motion six will be going to the Executive Policy Committee. We will now have By-laws. Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – FIRST READING ONLY

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws to be read first time…

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, just a moment. I think Councillor Wyatt…

Councillor Wyatt: I apologize for interrupting the Mayor, but I am going to, also on 26/2024 leave the chamber when the by-law comes up.

Mayor Gillingham: I am going to start again then Madam Speaker; I move that the following by-laws…

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are you declaring conflict, or is it...thank you, yeah. Okay. If you are declaring a conflict then you would be leaving the chamber now. And the reason of the conflict…is pecuniary? (inaudible) okay, maybe a little more specific. Ok, if it is the same reason. Let's just leave the chamber, as we discussed earlier. Okay?

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I am just wondering for point of clarity, are my colleagues leaving or declaring on By-law 72 and 90 or later on a by-law 26?

Madam Speaker: Maybe we will deal with everything except 26. Councillor Eadie also mentioned a different one.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, point of order, non-pecuniary just means it's not financial, so we need actually a positive statement on the record, i.e. what it is.

Madam Speaker: They are not declaring a conflict, it was decided they are just leaving chamber for reasons that Councillor Eadie stated earlier.

Councillor Rollins: Sorry, I heard Councillor Wyatt state a reason.

Madam Speaker: He is not going with that any longer.

Councillor Allard: Correct me if I am wrong, Councillor Wyatt declared he had a conflict of interest and then left his Chair.

Madam Speaker: He also said that he wasn't doing that any longer. No, after. So, how should we deal with these numbers Mr. Clerk. Because there's two that Councillor Eadie needs to leave for. And I guess Councillor Wyatt you are the same. Okay, the one, Mr. Mayor is 26/2024. If you could do that one last, please.

Mayor Gillingham: Ok. I can, would you like me to proceed with 72 and 90? Okay?

Madam Speaker: Yes please.

Mayor Gillingham: Then I will move the following by-laws to be read a first-time by-law 72/2024 and by-law 90/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law number 72/2024 and by-law number 90/2024.

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

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the following by-law be read a second time by-law 78/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law number 78/2024

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the rule be suspended and the by-law 78/2024 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the by-law 91/2024 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law number 91/2024

Mayor Gillingham: I move that by-law 91/2024 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law number 91/2024

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the rule be suspended and that by-law 91/2024 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried. Ok, just give us a moment, Mr. Mayor. Mr. Mayor, you may proceed.

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

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the following by-law be read a second time, by-law 26/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law number 26/2024

Mayor Gillingham: I move that by-law 26/2024 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? That's Carried. That concludes. We will just wait for the councillors to return. We are actually onto question period to the Mayor. Any questions? Any questions for the Mayor? We will just wait…just a moment. I am not dealing with any other point of orders today. So, we are going to wait.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, as indicated I will step away in a moment after the QP is over.

Madam Speaker: Yes, thank you, Mr. Mayor. We will just give it another 15 seconds, otherwise we are going to proceed…(inaudible) Yeah, as I said, another 15 seconds. Mr. Mayor…I've got the Chair, if you haven't noticed, thank you. We will proceed with the next Committee. Mr. Mayor, thank you for your patience. A lot of important business ahead yet. The Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and Environment. Councillor Mayes.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT
DATED JUNE 28, 2024**

Councillor Mayes: I'll move consent agenda items one through seven.

Madam Speaker: One through seven. There is an amending motion with item 3, so that will be pulled. I will call the question on one and two and four through seven. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Item 3 - Public and Private Overview for Garbage and Recycling Collection

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

Councillor Mayes: Yes, and I get, I think I get…do I speak to the motion as well at this point or do I speak to that when I close?

Madam Speaker: Your amending motion and the item.

Councillor Mayes: I am not amending.

Madam Speaker: There is amending motion. It has been circulated.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Lukes,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 3 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and the Environment dated June 28, 2024, be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendations 1 and 2 and replace with recommendation of the Winnipeg Public Service, namely:*

  "1. That collection of garbage, seasonal leaf/yard waste, and recycling services remain contracted at this time, and a review of the in-house/contract cost analysis be completed and reported back to the Standing Policy Committee prior to the final year of any new contract."

- *Renumber the remaining recommendation accordingly.*

Councillor Mayes: I can speak to that even though it yet to be on the tabled. Ok. So, I will speak and then I assume Councillor Browaty will. Okay. I'll get that 15 seconds back. So, there is a lot of history to this item. The Water and Waste Committee, Dobson, Santos, Gilroy, Mayes passed unanimously at the end of November a motion to bring one fifth of City garbage and recycling back in-house. That was amended and at the next Council meeting to ask for cost study, that report has come back. That report was not endorsed at Water and Waste Committee unanimously. Councillor Santos was not present. Councillors Dobson, Gilroy and myself voted for that. This item was passed unanimously at the Executive Policy Committee, so if it were to fail today a lot of people would have to change their votes, but we will see that in a few moments. Councillor Chambers may point out there isn't an angry mob outside demanding change, as there was on the Grants, probably because there was no opposition when it was passed unanimously at Water and Waste and at EPC no one felt the need to come down and lobby or demonstrate on this item, I would submit. So, I was focused largely on the cost implications in the first part of my remarks and perhaps speak more to a motion when I close. The cost...there is a provision that is in the motion taken from the report. Well, you will get a report back in the last year of the new contract. So, if you think it is great then we are going to get a report back in 2033, you go ahead and vote for that. That doesn't really bring me a whole lot of comfort, because the new contract, it's supposed to be seven years and it's supposed to start in 2027. My math is solid on that, and if you think yeah, we will get report back in 2033, fine. Not really much of a solution to problem. Secondly, we contract this stuff out two years in advance. You get a report back a year out in the last year and it's completely useless. I don't know why anyone would have included that. It's a completely meaningless statement. It in no way addresses any concern. So, please don't be deceived by that. The other thing, just before we get into the cost. There is a wild assertion in here that, if you vote for bringing it in-house you are pro-arson. You are indifferent to arson or words to that effect. No, the motion that came forward in December backed by Santos, Mayes, Dobson and Gilroy talked about a particular geographic area. That would be taken by the staff and moved over to say, well, this is the area where we do pick ups on Thursdays and Fridays to alleviate the risk of arson. So, we are just going to look at that area, and oh my god we are going to have to spread that over the whole week now. Thus, you are soft on arson. No, the original motion actually thought that through. So, Councillor Browaty's ward, Councillor Schreyer's ward, whichever have

a bit of the arson area in them would be left out. The focus is on downtown. Why is the focus on Downtown? Because that has been the source of a great many motions and concerns from people like Councillor Santos, Councillor Eadie and Councillor Gilroy. So, trying to address that, let's bring that area back in-house, we will have more direct control over garbage pick up. We can do something downtown. Councillor Rollins added in West Broadway, I think at EPC and that was supported as well. So, the map's final boundary is yet to be determined. So, cost elements here. We don't just take the cheapest offer on garbage and recycling services, in fact, Director Shank, she does a fine job and even talked about that when we went out in 2016 to replace the original group from 2011. We didn't just look for the lowest cost; we had a lot of troubles with the lowest cost. We don't just take lowest cost. And you know that is true, because in 2016 when we went to two zones, we didn't take cheapest bid for both zones. We deliberately went with two different players. As the one company who was the leading proponent for both zones, so we had to go with the second-place finisher in the second zone. So, also the numbers are given about…why are we here? We are here because we had a nasty debate in 2016 about CUPE raising some issues, about breach of the RFP. So, he said let's get out in front of it this time, let's get a costing done. They have a mixed model in Ottawa and Calgary. What do they have to say, and Ottawa continues to have a mixed model. Some of it are in-house, some of it privatized. If it was such a no brainer to go all private, it is odd that Ottawa would still have a mixed model. It's odd that Toronto, even under Mayor Ford didn't go all private, they went mixed model. Calgary, surely a bastion of free enterprise and conservativism, also has mixed model. They have moved to have some private and some public. We talk a lot here about keeping up with other cities. My goodness, we just saw a provision about Vancouver a few motions ago. So, let's keep up with other cities and have a mixed model, I would submit to you. The number that we're given in the report on Calgary is that by contracting out about a third of the city, they save 538,000 dollars and Mr. Gordichuck who was terrific say, well, that's a little is higher now. But how on earth, does Calgary if they contract out a third of the city, much bigger city than us, only saved 500 thousand. But we are saying, if we bring it in for a fifth of our smaller city, my God, it is more than double that, it's well over 1 million dollars. The math doesn't really add up, unless we are completely low balling our existing private services. So, cost is not the only issue here. I know we have some comments earlier today. People on budget working group saying I am concerned about cost. That is fair enough. But the cost here is not just going to be what you see in front of you. And even that is mixing garbage and recycle. Take out the recycling, because that's what we get at the Committee this time. That is pretty complicated stuff, bid problems. So, what are we looking at here? At most 1 million a year in each of seven years. The way the report is written, it adds it all up, oh seven years 10 million...no, it's about, maybe if you accept this, a million a year, on a basis of contracts that are worth for the city-wide 40 million dollars plus for the whole city. So, five bucks more per household to do this. You just voted nine bucks more per household on the compost. I thought we would be debating that, but I have to change my phrasing. We just voted 9 dollars more per household on the compost. So, if you are concerned about budget, then I would submit to you, this isn't that big of concern. If we want to bring some services back in-house. Second point, none of this is going to cost anything in 2025. We've extended the existing contract to 2027. So, if you are concerned, if you are on the budget working group, this is not going to have any impact in 2025. Yes, we need to buy some vehicles in 2026 to get going in 2027. If you're saying what is your funding source? Let me say this, we approved two meetings ago, 23 million dollars in additional debt to help finance the southwest rec center. What was the funding source to pay for interest on that? Can anyone remember? It's not in the report. So, don't try too hard. We didn't specify a funding source to service 23 million dollars in debt. So, I am not sure we need to specify a funding source for something that is going to kick in in 2026 or 2027 here today. Also, the million dollars additional only works if you accept the city staff estimate that costs are going to inch up by 2 percent per year. Then there is the delta, as they say around here, the difference of 1 million dollars a year. What if, what if the private costs exceed a million, or two percent a year? And why would I say that? Because they have gone up, and here Councillor Schreyer will be delighted, they've gone up 60 percent over the past nine years. Bulletproof. It was 25 million, public number. 40 million in the last report. So, that is way more than two percent per year. So, the costs of private service are exceeding, they are climbing far more than two percent a year. If it's even four or five percent a year, the gap narrows to nothing. So, I reject that the private...that the in-house option is going to cost more. Secondly, we said under transit plus the smaller zones allow more people to compete. So, one would expect more people to compete for the private contracts, we would save even more. The other issues that come up. Oh, they will now they have a strike threat. Well, if they unionize in the private sector they have a strike threat, we went through this in the transit plus debate. So, yes, people are allowed to unionize. Yes, there's a strike threat, however we can assert they're an essential service. That's what will happen. Mr. Delbridge would probably differ. We can take it to an arbitrator to decide if they are an essential service or not. So, is it a strike threat? Yes. Is it a strike threat if they unionized Miller and GFL, yes, it is. There is talk earlier, I'm probably going to need a brief extension. Thank you. Well, I will take as long as I can on this one.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I could go on and on about the numbers. But it would be very…well, A. I don't accept that this is a more expensive option, even if you break it all down and you say ok, just for garbage, just for a fifth of the city, we think it is 1 million dollars a year more. Five bucks per household. I am not convinced we won't get some value in, and beyond that, we maintain some leverage then, we maintain some competition. What happens if we don't do this and the bids are much higher? Just like what we have seen. I don't think this is going up 2 percent per year. It is going up a whole lot more. I've got this on my side, it's going up from 25 million to 40 million dollars over the life of this contract, per year.

That is way more than two percent a year. So, it isn't going to affect the upcoming budget. It would have budget impacts in the future. We will only know that once we go out to tender. So, the line was used earlier today about...we need some certainty through negotiated collective agreements for our costs. Well, I guess this is the chance to bring in some certainty in a sea of uncertainty. We don't know what we're going to do on compost, we don't know what (inaudible) is going to do on recycling, we don't now what the bids will be on, if we keep all the garbage service contracted out. But we do know this, if we bring in a fifth of the city, not all of it, a fifth of the city, to deal with downtown issues, we bring that in-house that way they will be through a negotiated collective agreement. Moreover, CUPE has said we are willing to talk about the shift scheduling that is identified as part of this cost toward the 1 million. So, we might be even to, who knows, negotiate with CUPE in the next collective agreement to further reduce those costs. So, more later, but on the cost matter, I really don't think the costs are, as stated here, 5 dollars a house, and even if they are, worse case, 5 dollars a household, and we just voted for 9 dollars a household per year on compost.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty your opportunity to speak to the item and your amending motion.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Most Winnipeggers don't really care who provides the service. They just want the service to work. I've not heard any arguments yet on this proposal to take a portion of the service, to move it in-house to make our service better. That is not what I really heard yet. Again, the amendment I move forward is, if we, for the next contract let's take a look at it. If there has been too much consolidation in the industry, and now all of a sudden it makes sense to bring some or all of it in-house, let's have that discussion at that time. There are other things that are changing between now and then, as well. The report doesn't mention it, but we are still waiting to hear about the opportunity to have full producer responsibility on our recyclables. We have the opportunity even to potentially opt out of offering to pick ups ourselves. We could say to MMSM, we don't want to do it. You are taking over on that. That is an opportunity that should be an option for us sometime, around the time of our next contract. Again, why did we not see demonstration outside of city hall? No one is proposing that we stop picking up garbage or recycling or yard waste. But again, according to our Public Service, our professionals, this is going to cost more money. We have a financial situation here at the City. We are talking about providing a better service, but it is going to cost more money. I encourage you to look at the motion here and in the time before our next contract, I think we should look at all options, perhaps including bringing some or all of our service in-house. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, it is about time to have this discussion again. Maybe more concrete than ever before. I know back a couple of terms ago, well, there was some misinterpretation and misunderstanding in terms of how our By-laws and Charter was written maybe how to be interpreted in terms of the obligations we have to our city workers in terms of being allowed and thus encouraged by the system, because that is what it says. With the administration's directive to how do we put that in the whereas clauses that the Administration be authorized to do all the things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing. Well, we have these by-laws already well in place before, and we dropped the ball, is the way I'm going to explain it. But we don't need to go back. We learned our lessons. Here we are, two terms later. Facts, some facts just remain the same, and Councillor Mayes did an excellent job, usurping me in a way, and in terms of explaining the way this country works municipally, when it comes to garbage and recycling. So, I will reiterate. There is some difference of perspective. It's slight. Having said that, Councillor Mayes made some excellent points. The reality is, we are the only major city that doesn't have at least one quadrant of the city that's done by in-house, done in-house by city workers for garbage and recycling. There is no other city like this. Why did the other cities go to at least having one quadrant being in-house, while other cities went half in-house. Some, two that I am aware of, Calgary and Vancouver went 100 percent in-house. I remember when the head Naheed Nenshi came to Winnipeg for the 2015 Federation of Canadian Municipalities. He was the new Mayor of Calgary. He brought in 100 percent in house garbage and/or recycling for the City of Calgary. I talked with him about it at the Federation of Canadian Municipalities just in downtown Winnipeg here. And he said because it's cheaper. The next election he got elected with what? 75 percent of the vote? Was he kidding anybody, did he trick anybody? No, I don't think so. I think he was dealing with reality. He expressed it on behalf of Calgarians. And they re-elected him. Did they care? Sounds like they care. I'm sure that he got re-elected on more than just garbage and recycling. But he went 100 percent in-house, with caveats. Why with Caveats? To keep the checks and balances. That's what it's about, that's our job, checks and balances, where are the checks and balances when it comes to our garbage and recycling? We don't have it. Other cities do. Even when they go 100 percent in-house in the case of Naheed Nenshi in the capitalist bastion of Calgary. Who is kidding whom? What? They didn't know what they were getting into. What, did they regret it? Had they gone to all contracted out? No. Because do you know why? Actually, when you have your mix, that's when you actually have competition, when it comes to Public Services. Remember, this is not private enterprise. This is Public Service. It is our charter; it's a job of the 16 people in this circle to take responsibility for this with the Administration. It's in the charter. This is our job. What's the best we can do? Checks and balances is part of the procedure of all sorts of systems, social systems, companies and governments. That's what we have. Where is our checks and balances system on here? We have Councillor Mayes just talked about the inflation rates we had. And I made my point here over the years. I hope I'm not boring anybody, when it comes to

being concerned over the City budget. When it comes down to it, actually, you'll notice that most cities have both in-house and contracted. And I will say that's when you have your best checks and balances, because that's actually when you have true, true accountable responsible, reasonable, obvious, visual accountability and competition. That's how you get competition when it comes to Public Services. We don't have that competition, it's not the same when you just privatize Public Services. That's not the same competition. We've had years for our city to observe the rest of Canada when it comes to how they deal with garbage and recycling. How do I know this? Because they have told us. They have told us in Winnipeg, back in 2015 in my first year, for a third of us. Our first year as a councillor here, they explained. They were here in Winnipeg. Cities from across the country, why they went in-house. Or they have been in house for a long time and why they kept it, or why they had both. We have been talking about this for years. So, one thing this is not, is all of a sudden. That's the last thing it is. We have been talking about this for years. This is not all of a sudden. This is not a surprise. Why? Because I've been boring you for eight years, nine years here talking about this. So, there you go. No surprise. And it's not about what I say. It's not about what I think. It's about what our counterparts from around the country have been doing. Are we wasting our time talking with our fellow Councillors from across the country? Going to the Federation of Canadian Municipality's meetings? They have been educating us. They like what they do. They haven't changed their mind. It's our chance to keep up, catch up, do what they do. Then we'll really learn. We have been hearing for too long theoretical analysis here in Winnipeg that contradicts what they have been doing in other cities. How long do you want to keep it up? We don't have to. We can change that right now. It's a long time coming. The opposite of all of a sudden, it's about time. People don't care. People care about their taxes. People care about the fact that why is it? That we were even contemplating eliminating arts funding. Why? We didn't do that four years ago, eight years ago, because it's getting worse. What's getting worse? I've always talked about construction inflation, but I have explained it in this chamber over the years, the relationship to how that relates to garbage and recycling, because it is the high capital, the capital intense industries. When we decide to simply contract it out, that's where you get your highest rate of inflation. Want to know where that comes from? Brian Mayes just said inflation rate for garbage and recycling. Why? It's capital intense. And therefore, that's our challenge. These are our big-budget issues. This is where we've got our highest rate of inflation, and this is where we have to account to the taxpayer, and we can do a better job right now. Not all of a sudden, but after terms of dealing with this issue. This is our chance right now. Let's not pretend this is all of a sudden. That's the last thing it is. Ask our fellow Councillors across Canada, because I've been talking about this for years. This is no surprise.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy followed by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I guess I'm trying to figure out why we wouldn't want to do this, we know that other major cities are doing this. That it's kind of good to have some in-house services. We know there's not much of a cost difference and we would have some control. Now, going back to what Councillor Browaty was saying, I disagree with him. I have major issues with garbage in my area. This is why I have an interest in bringing some of the garbage in house. It goes to what we voted on earlier, which is our consolidation, Madam Speaker. One of the reasons why we couldn't consolidate is because we don't have inhouse services. If we had inhouse services, we might be able to consolidate and have a better garbage service. We might be able to have parks doing it, Public Works doing it, and all these different people working in complete siloes, if we had an in house service, we would actually be able to be able to do it and collaborate within one department, which I think would benefit the whole city and improving some of the garbage issues and rules that we have in the city, Madam Speaker. And with it being very minimal cost and knowing that we're not the first to do this, that there's...we're not asking for this to be a city-wide garbage contract. We're asking for a small portion in house, and that's worked in other cities. I guess my bigger question is, why aren't we doing it, Madam Speaker? Like, why are we struggling with not putting a portion of this in house? Now I've really got to question this, when we do have reports out there that say...we already have these reports that say it costs very minimal. We already know that through other jurisdictions, this is working out. And we also know that we're having a major garbage issue in the City of Winnipeg. And that you have Councillors that are impacted by it every single day, that they are looking to consolidate the services, and we can't, Madam Speaker, because our own garbage, our Water and Waste division doesn't have all the tools necessary to do their job, and their name is Water and Waste. We could be streamlining some of this work if we had the right staff that had the ability to do this work. And that's, Madam Speaker is, where we save money. That's when we give the best bang for the dollar, for Winnipeggers, when they see a clean, vibrant city. And we can't do that because we do not have the tools necessary in order to do that. And that's why, Madam Speaker, other cities have looked at bringing some in house. So they have those tools available to them when there are issues that arise. They have the equipment and the staff ready to handle that. And so, Madam Speaker, I don't think it's best practice for us to not be looking at what other cities are doing and making their cities better and cleaner when we're struggling. And we don't want to look at an opportunity here to have a portion of it inhouse, when there's very little cost. But a big benefit to the city, to the citizens of Winnipeg. So, I guess I have questions on why we're not supporting this, when we have had constant, constant motions that have gone to Council, with constant review of these motions by our city staff, and yet, we're not looking at bringing some inhouse service. We've also had our unions come to us saying you can never compare apples to apples, Madam Speaker, because we don't have an inhouse service. That, you know, you don't know what it's like to have inhouse service because you don't have it, check with Calgary, check with Edmonton, check with Montreal, look and see what the cities are doing. So, Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity here to do some of this I really believe that having some care and

control over our garbage, especially in our department that is called Water and Waste is really critical, Madam Speaker. And I would really like to see some consideration of bringing all of our...consolidating our waste, Madam Speaker but we are trying to look at, as inner City Councillors are dealing with this, but quite frankly, Madam Speaker, when we get told we can't because we don't have the tools, that's a problem. So, I want to thank Councillor Mayes for his work on this file. He's done a lot of really great work, you know, finding out information from other municipalities and his work kind of figuring this all out on water waste, because I know he knows and understands the issues that we're having in the inner city. And I didn't like how they were trying to scare us at the inner city saying there would be more fires. That's really, really wrong, especially when we're dealing with so much already. Quite frankly, I believe bringing a portion of it inhouse would benefit the inner city, Madam Speaker. That's why I am here, so I do want it on the record that we do have issues in garbage and having inhouse personnel that have the equipment to have it would be very beneficial for the citizens of Winnipeg. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, next is Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Wyatt: If it's not inhouse, does that mean it's outhouse? See if you guys are awake. I'm going to move Madam Speaker, that the matter be referred back to the Committee. I would like to speak to it briefly.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, go ahead.

Councillor Wyatt: If the issue here is not about labour unionized versus non-unionized, not about inhouse versus contracted out. If the issue is truly about the need to address inner city sanitation services, then the example given on the report, which at the City of Vancouver is layered services. The report is called public and private overview for garbage and recycling collection, when it should be called a layered service approach to address inner city sanitation services. Because from what I see here, the City of Vancouver has got a neat program where they involve community organizations that hire individuals with barriers to employment, to get them to be employed, and they go out and clean up the neighborhoods. Why aren't we looking at that? So that's why I am moving that it be referred back, I don't think that's even being considered here from what I can see.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes, you have an opportunity to respond to the referral.

Councillor Mayes: We seem to be a bit confused between what's going on here. The original motion came a couple of years ago to try and avoid the exact scenario Councillor Schreyer was talking about, how we the point of which private firm should we give it to, and then CUPE and others come forward and say, we are breaching RFP. Or you should be doing this, it would be better. So, this time we were going to do it right, I think we still can. This time we're going to get some research done before we go out to market. Why the mixed system in Ottawa? Why the mixed system in Calgary, that they moved to since they used to have all inhouse. So, we tried to get that report in. The motion in December, unanimously supported by Santos, Mayes, Dobson, Gilroy was, we should bring a fifth inhouse so in the other cities, we check various discussions here about keeping up with other cities to have...and other programs, fine, but keep up with other cities and have a mixed model. So, the debate was at that time, to bring in a fifth. The amendment to EPC, back in December was, well, let's get a cost study done and look at it, maybe can we do something what other cities do; by combining services, I think in good faith by the Mayor to say, can we try to combine some of these? Hance the Vancouver reference. I think we still could combine services if we bring some of it inhouse. Why the downtown? Why not St. Vital and St. River and Transcona Wards? Because the most complaints, the most issues have risen out of downtown. So, that's why you take a zone that's downtown. Exact parameters. Should west Broadway be in? I don't know. Probably. Various parts of Point Douglas should certainly be in, Mynarski should be in. Large chunks of Councillor Gilroy's ward should be in. So, I don't support referral. I mean, this idea of, well the next time…this is the next time. These are seven-year awards, and we give them out a couple of years in advance. I'm not really sure if Councillor Browaty is talking about 2033 or if he is talking about the contracts we'll issue to as of Feb 1, 2027. You can clarify that, I guess. But if you're talking about this round, this is the hour. This is the vote. If you're talking about 2033, why? Why should we vote on something, next time in 2033, we'll get that report? It's ridiculous. So, no, I don't support referral. I don't know what would be added by that. I think that this is a good faith effort to do something for the inner city, and as Councillor Gilroy says. The only way we can do that is if we have these people who are employees inhouse, and then we can sort it out. Maybe they can do more of the bulking. Maybe they can do more of the multi-family. Maybe they can do more of the boulevard cleanup that is such an issue in areas like Councillor Gilroy's.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now vote on the referral. All in favour of referral back to Executive Policy Committee, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Wyatt.

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 1, Nays 15.

Madam Speaker: Okay. The referral is defeated. Yes, Councillor Wyatt, Councillor Eadie, then Councillor Allard.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I guess, let's not let a good debate get in the way of the issue. So, the reality here, Madam Speaker, is we're trying to sort out an issue that, as Councillor Mayes smartly had pointed out. The neighborhoods that he suggested probably should be the neighborhoods added in. What I find interesting is the fact that the City of Vancouver is doing that. I mean, if you want to point to city that has social challenges, the likes of which maybe, we could claim to rival though I don't think we do. Not yet, thank God. But the challenges they face in their inner city is huge. And they have turned to a program where they work with community groups and organizations to hire people with barriers to employment. And by the looks of it, it's not a massive program we're talking here, it consists of three to four staff, daytime sanitation team. And then in the evening at night, they have five to six staff. They call that the enhanced street cleaning team. And by the sounds of it, it probably helps not only the individuals who have barriers to employment but probably helps the community organizations in terms of revenue that need it to fund the services that they are doing probably in the inner city is my bet. If that's what the issue is about, if that is the challenge we're facing, why aren't we looking at the third option? Yes, there is the contract out option, option one, which is the one that we have been on. I have voted, opposed, contracting out of garbage in the past. That's not what we're doing here today. A contract is already in place. Number two, the other option is to move us away from having a solely contracted out service, that's not what we're doing here again. The contract is already in place. We're asking to amend them. Or option three, which is really not on the table at all, it appears, even though the administrative report, which Councillor Browaty cited quite well, refers extensively to this layered service approach, where they try to manage waste in their downtown east side. That's the neighborhood most (inaudible) east hastings, we all know that. And that neighborhood we've heard of. I've been there, toured with a Councillor James Green, when he was still with us, many years ago, who loved that area. And, you know, they have managed to address the sanitation area, the issue affecting that area by having a hybrid of the two. That's not a city employee. That's not. So, it's not CUPE employee. It's not a contracted-out employee, but rather a partnership, if you like, with existing, I'm assuming not-for-profit community organizations that then hire individuals with barriers to employment. And I am assuming they are probably hiring individuals who are trying to turn their lives around, the very individuals who might have been living in those streets before. And giving them employment and a new start to their life, and something for their resume to start that off again. I think it's a good idea. Why aren't we talking about that? Why is the report not called a layered service approach to address inner city sanitation? And indeed, in the event, if it passes, it passes. In the event it doesn't pass, I would hope the motion that come forward to the Budget Committee to look at this. Because I don't think the cost could be any…it could be much less than what's being projected in the report if we elect to go the route that the City of Vancouver has decided to go on to address this challenge. At the end of the day, it's about removing the rubbish, the garbage, the mattresses, the debris collecting on lanes and streets. Not just in the downtown, but you see it all around the downtown. And they are fire hazards. You see them piled up in BFI bins right up against buildings, light a match. And not only will the BFI thing blow up, but the whole building. It has to be addressed. There's no two ways about it. Especially once, and heaven forbid, a loss of life because of it, and we have to address it now. But let's not get torn apart that it has to be the left versus the right, labour versus contract. Let's address the problem. That's what I think the neighbourhood wants, just to get it done, I think. And it seems that Vancouver is coming together to do that. So, I would suggest to you that the third approach, the third option is something that clearly not something we're caught up in, just the headline itself, the title of the report itself, leads us to that. And I agree with a lot of the points Councillor Mayes made about. and Councillor Schreyer, that in the long run, I believe that a mixed-use service is better, but I don't just believe that it's something as isolated as this. I think there should be a more, how should I say, a further defined contract areas in the city that allow for a greater mixed use for local competition. Not only to allow for public sector to be able to deliver garbage, but more importantly in some ways, to allow for local garbage companies to be able to bid on our contracts. We, you know, 20 years ago, no, more than that now, it was the late 90s when Council in its wisdom decided to consolidate all of its contracts and drive out literally, drive out and shut down local small businesses, who were doing garbage collection for the City of Winnipeg in smaller contract areas. And what did we do? We handed it over to the multinationals, who basically run the garbage show across north America. Nobody talks about that anymore. Versus local entrepreneurs who were getting the job done, hiring local people, were looking after their employees. You know, if you want to talk to some of them, I know, I know one in particular actually, I remember it well, when they came and we talked about it back in '98. So, you know, Madam Speaker, the issue should be, there is a third option that is not on the table. The amendment doesn't pass because I'm not going to

vote for it today. I think, that's the option, that's why I voted for referral, to keep the discussion going. But clearly, Council wants to have this left versus right fight. Go ahead. Well, the issue doesn't get addressed. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Well, Madam Speaker, I rise opposed to the amending motion from Councillor Browaty, and I'll be supporting the Standing Committee, and I will be supporting EPC's decision. Madam Speaker, I just want to start by maybe educating people. I think somebody told a little story about it before, but did you know that I grew up in the north end. And a lot of my pals were very, from poor families, Madam Speaker, and guess what, Madam Speaker, guess how we got them employable and out of, you know, enough money to stay out of poverty. We actually hired them, as employees, a whole bunch of people I know. All of them are just staring to retire now, Madam Speaker. They are retiring now; they are my age or older. They retired, and Madam Speaker, being employed by the City of Winnipeg is a good job. It's one where, you know, at first maybe you don't know how to drive the truck. But if you have to have another person. You hire somebody. What, do they need a university degree to do that, Madam Speaker? Now, so we could do that ourselves. We actually have people who train people how to provide us our city services, Madam Speaker. I have a friend who retired from doing that. He used to train workers after working in Forestry for years. Now, I want to talk about this report, okay. Consolidation read that report. They make it sound like everything's improved. There's no need to consolidate because By-law enforcement, who we also want to merge. Well, now, we have streamlined everything, and everything is hunky-dory in the old William Whyte and Dufferin neighborhood. My green team now is calling it every bunch of garbage. Like bulk waste layering it up, okay? So, when you look at this thing and they talk about the fire map, the arson thing. Now, it says, you know, Thursday and Friday collection, this is important, whatever. Well, my whole ward is collected on Thursday. And in terms of the Mynarski ward need in certain areas, under this, we should draw a line at Mountain Avenue because everything north, it's pretty darn good, Madam Speaker. Now, bringing this inhouse gives us control. It does, and then, we don't have to go to the contractor and say, oh, we have to negotiate and pay you more, because we will have the rights to collecting the bulk waste in that area, too. And we can have our employees, Madam Speaker. Go and do it without having to negotiate with the contractor. That's called control. We could have, you now, try to provide a better service. I'm not going to start comparing the private sector, we know it does a pretty good job, but that's besides the point. We need control in this centre, downtown and around. I'm willing to do anything in consolidating. I don't know, I think that the Winnipeg Public Service doesn't like change. Because every time we propose something to be changed, there's always an excuse not to do it. Now, I was once told by somebody how clean Calgary is. Even with litter, Madam Speaker. And guess what, at FCM, walking around at two in the morning with my good pal and colleague Councillor Schreyer, notes oh, and Councillor Santos, as a matter of fact as well. Who did we see? City of Calgary employees actually cleaning up the litter. City of Calgary employees cleaning up garbage. So, now, and they are probably doing it on the highways in. You drive down Portage Avenue, we'll just get a bunch of volunteers and just train them how to pick up garbage, right? And send them out to do it…Madam Speaker, what Vancouver is doing I think that's important to help people to find jobs, but the city itself of Vancouver, they can just go there, train them up and hire them. That's what they could do. I just also want to mention on this report. What did they say? 5 dollars a household. Now, we do have, we are paying for the recycle plant. But I would point out that recycling is costing each household 51 dollars a year, 51 dollars. Here they say 5 dollars for collecting garbage. I would imagine we would be collecting the recycling as well, Madam Speaker. Maybe we can save the water bill payers some money because I'll tell you right now. You just whack them with another 9-dollar flat fee. The people are struggling in the very neighborhoods we're talking about taking control, Madam Speaker, to make sure things get done fast, efficient and properly. Which is what this is really about, Madam Speaker. So, like, I can't believe that people would not consider this. The Public Service has told us, oh, we can't. We could…we could have brought under consolidation could have the litter bin collection been done. We actually, it's all collected by the City of Winnipeg anyway those bins. The City of Winnipeg workers in their trucks. They pick up those bins. That could have been consolidated. It's a matter of how you look at it. Consolidating…or taking one-fifth of the city as a publicly administrated delivered garbage service on all levels because we're moving into this curbside composting thing. My goodness. Madam Speaker, the compost curbside thing, we are making people pay 9 dollars on their water bill. And nobody is going to use it, well, I shouldn't say that. Vast majorities of these neighbourhood that we are talking about, that could be covered by the city. It's going to be a mess. Because they can barely use, a lot of people, the system as it is. And the reason the arson, say we going to get to those garbages, you know what happens, right? You get garbage pickers, and they come and on garbage day they come and dump them, looking for stuff. Making a mess. They don't clean it up, Madam Speaker. So, anyway, there is another program, if we got a program, what we could do is Calgary it costs...Vancouver costs 25 cents. The Head of Solid Waste was telling me about this. And they actually send in trucks to clean up lots. We could do that if we have control over that area, and I thank Councillor Mayes, the Chairperson with all the work he's done, because he does know what the garbage problem is in this city.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. To you and to my colleagues, I will be supporting the Standing Policy Committee recommendation, I will be supporting the Executive Policy Committee recommendation. I will not be supporting

the amending motion. I think there's no surprise, Madam Speaker, through you to the chamber that I will be supporting the direction from the Executive Policy Committee, as I think we have spoken at length in this chamber about the…well, at least I have and others in the chamber about the merits of having a mixed system where we're having a portion of the service delivery inhouse. It allows us to know in our bones, in our budgets, what is the cost of garbage collection in house. And also, given that we're talking about sectors having leverage. And so, if you're in an employment interview, one of the things employers look at is, well, what's your salary? In terms of moving to a new job. You're lucky if you have a job, so that you can use your salary as leverage to get that next job. Well, we don't have a base right now to compare to. What we have is one sector, and we get responses from that one sector. And we don't have that inhouse capacity, which I think has been the core argument through you, Madam Speaker, from Councillor Mayes. From Councillor Mayes, since the very beginning, is that if we have competition between the public and the private sector that is the way to get the best service delivery to residents, because otherwise, we're not in as good a negotiating position, because when we're negotiating or when we're putting out tenders, we can say, if the tenders come up too high. Well, you know what? I think we'll just bump up the FTEs and bump up the budget and bump up capital and our own waste management program here in the city. We don't have that option now. We have been followed out in terms of that function of the city. And I think we should fill that void, that I don't know the history of uni cities as well as others. But I suspect it was, at some time, perhaps other parts of the city were different as well. But I believe in St. Boniface ward, this would have been a public sector function. And if you talk to the people who remember, St. Boniface for union city, they would say you could eat off the sidewalks. So, in terms of service level comparisons, perhaps that one is not fair. But I do think fundamentally, that having a mixed system, even the beginning of a mixed system, which is being proposed here by the Standing Policy Committee, and the Executive Policy Committee would give us that, that perspective, that option, and that leverage when we're dealing with the private sector as a whole. So those will be my reasons for voting yes to amending the motion, and for the motions from the Standing Policy Committee and Executive Policy Committee. Thank you.

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Great comments from all my Council colleagues. I just want to firstly apologize the Chairman on Water and Waste, that I was not able to attend the Water and Waste Committee meeting when we were debating this issue. And I finally had a chance to really fully review the entire document. And at this point, I have a lot of questions. And of course, that should have been happening at Water and Waste, but maybe the current Chair could alleviate some of my concerns, because right now as it stands, when I read it on the outset, I have a lot of questions. And I actually don't support the report in its entirety. It's actually a piece of garbage, no pun intended. So, my questions…my questions are basically, as I go through it, you know, specifically with page five: inhouse option resource requirements, existing contractor has ten-hour shifts while inhouse services would be operating in an eight-hour shift. I'm assuming that's because we would have to have collector agreements, and you can only work between, you know, what, 9:30 to 4:30, or only an eight-hour shift. Maybe you can kind of, explain a little bit further why it would be less hours, versus the current hours that existing contractors have. It also states that collection would take place on a five-day collection schedule instead of currently what it's doing right downtown it's scheduled on a Thursday or Friday. If we move inhouse services, would raise the risk of arson, as collection would be spread out over the entire week to remain efficient and utilize staff full time. That raises like a lot of questions and concerns for me. I think the Chair had made mention of it before, but it's just quite not clear to me. If we were to do collection on a five-day, how would that increase the risk of arson if we're actually removing more of the garbage. Wouldn't that lessen the risk of arson? So that just paragraph in itself makes absolutely no sense to me. And I don't understand that. And then it actually mentions that the collection of bulk material during the regular collection operation will not be viable. So, does that mean if we were to go inhouse, they are no longer going to be doing bulky waste collection material pickup during this five-day collection? That doesn't work for the Point Douglas community. We need that bulky waste collection pickup. So, again, I would like further clarity on that. And I'm sorry to the current Chair, but I would have had those opportunities during the meeting. So, right now there's just a lot of questions I have. Page six, future contract comparison cost determination. Cost per dwelling units served in the estimated number of dwelling units in the designated zone was used to estimate an annual contracting cost. Well, as I remember during the budget process, there was a motion to actually review how we were going to be charging for garbage collection. My understanding is it's going to be now tacked on as a fee onto the utility bill. So how does that impact moving forward, if we're going to be doing a charge onto a utility bill, this cost estimate, it actually doesn't work. I think that it needs to be flushed out first before we can take this 55.1-million-dollar option, which is going to be inhouse. I really don't think that number is going to be actually true. So then, I have questions about that. What are we doing with the current motion or current report that's coming forward to our committee about actually the new fees that are being imposed in our utility bills? How does that work together in conjunction together. Again, I don't understand. And moving along, future organic program and garbage consolidation report impact. Obviously, this is completely incomplete because we don't even have that report coming back to us. And they've actually admitted that, that there is no...it's not included in this comparison, as it requires further additional inhouse equipment and operating hours outside the baseline collection activity. We don't even actually know what those numbers are. So, what is that dollar figure going to look to us? I think the only positive thing I can take away from this report is the additional options for consideration by Council, which we have done, which prove the changes to the current services to improve garbage waste collections in the downtown core area. And I do remember

supporting that at Water and Waste, which is increased frequency of bulky sweep. I know we just recently supported Main Street Project in their clean sweep with garbage and litter pickup around Main Street. So, there's a lot of good work that the city is doing already when it comes to bulky waste and litter pickup and having NGOs provide their support, similar to what the City of Vancouver is doing with their layered services. We are piloting that. I think it's going to be a very successful program. Also, I do not want to make unnoticed that the weekly garbage, weekly garbage pickup at encampments is becoming a successful program, something that I had been advocating for within my community. So I know there's a lot of good work happening, but unfortunately, with this current report, I don't even support any of the motions that are coming forward, so I don't know how I'm going to look to the clerk and how I can just basically vote no on all of it because I do not support this report as a whole, and I wish I had an opportunity to be at that committee to maybe make some slight amendments for some further information. So unfortunately, that's kind of where I stand at this point, and maybe the Chair could alleviate some of my concerns, but I'll leave it there for now. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Mayor Gillingham.

Mayor Gillingham: There we go, sorry. I was trying for my button there. I won't be supporting EPC's recommendations. Sometimes in the midst of all our files, that we deal with a daily basis, we miss one. Quite frankly, I missed this one. So, after having a chance to further review the report, I'm going to be supporting Councillor Browaty's motion. His motion, Councillor Lukes' motion. I thank them for it. I think what's at the heart of this, and the reason that I'm not going to be supporting what Councillor Mayes is putting forward is primarily this, and our staff in the administrative report makes it very clear, is that it would be 10 million dollars more than what is projected right now. 10 million dollars for the next seven years more than what is currently being projected with the private contractors without any clear, expected benefit. To the current service levels. So, paying 10 million more for no benefit just to me doesn't make sense. I don't think it's responsible to the people of Winnipeg. I do appreciate that Councillor Mayes pointed out that Calgary has actually gone away from 100 percent of their collection being in housed, and they have gone back, and they now have 25 percent of the contracts, collection services with a private contractor. So, they have reversed course on what they have done. But the key thing to me is value for money, and that is, that is stated there when our staff does the bills. They don't see any increased in benefit to going inhouse, but it would cost more. Right now, competitive bids are consistent. There's a lot of competition in the market with getting competitive bids, and so that's important. I know, through you, Madam Speaker, Councillor Schreyer, raised the matter of this being capital intensive work. That's true. But our City also, when we purchased vehicles and all the capital assets needed to do this work. We'll be paying the same inflationary prices that everybody else pays as well. We're not immune to inflationary prices as the Councillor has spoken of consistently over the years. And so there wouldn't be a great savings on the capital-intensive investments that would have to be made if we, as a city, did the work ourselves. So, to me, I'm not supportive of coming inhouse with this work. It's going to cost us more money for no notable benefit, no increased benefit in service level that can be seen at this point. I want to just point out maybe something else; that I appreciate that Councillor Gilroy raised. I think she raised something that's been a scare tactic. The staff, when they were reviewing this, just quite frankly being factual. The inner-city pick-up is organized as a late week pickup due to arson. And if some of those areas move to the Monday to Thursday pickup, then that really goes against the strategy we've adopted as a city. And I think that's important to note as well. So, I appreciate all of Councillor Mayes's work, but not supportive of the direction he wants to take this. No benefit, more money, and so I don't think that's a direction that the rate payers of Winnipeg need us to be going.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? No further speakers. Councillor Browaty, your opportunity to close, and over to Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. I really have nothing additional to add.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes to close?

Councillor Mayes: (inaudible) Clarify something it his motion, which talks about the next contract. Are you talking about currently, we've got two contracts that are extended to expire January 31, 2027? Then the next new contract will take…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes. Out of order.

Councillor Mayes: Fair point.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty, I will give you another opportunity if you wish to add anything more. No? Okay. Councillor Mayes to close.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. This reminds me in many ways of a vote we had here back in 2013 when we were voting on the future of Golf services in the City of Winnipeg. We have some courses the City owns that are privately run and some that are run by the City and union represented. And there was a recommendation to just get rid of those, to privatize

all of those. And it was a great debate actually. And we actually have a strategy. A mix of people who are on EPC and not on EPC voted against that report. I went first and did my numbers act. And went there and then that went last. And didn't mention a single number but talked with some emotion about the importance of having a mixed service, and that carried the day. Even Councillor Browaty voted with us, as a matter of fact. I think that (inaudible) might have voted with us as well. But many overtones of that, and I'll come back at end with my remarks on that. A couple of things, the Mayor says it's a 10 million dollars difference. That's if you include recycling, the motion that came out of the community doesn't include recycling so that's the 8 point something million if you take the number that's here over seven years. 280-million-dollar contract we'll be looking at. At least 40 million a year. At least 40 million a year. It is 40 million a year now. Seven years. Wow. You're going to increase that by maybe 8 million over seven years on the 280-million-dollar base. So, if that's of great concern to you, okay, but it's a very minor change over a 280-million-dollar garbage and cycling regime that we'll be voting on, sometime during the life of this Council. Also to say, that there's no benefit. We heard that from the Mayor, from Councillor Browaty. Here's what Calgary said in a report that's quoted in this report. And so, Calgary, it's a mix now. It's a mix. It didn't go all the way privatized, and it's not all inhouse. It's a mix, which is what we're debating here today. What's the advantage of that? Here's the report. A mixed service delivery model of private and public sector collection services would foster competition and could lead to a more cost-effective way of doing business. It's Councillor Allard's point. If you have no ability to deliver the service inhouse, you're really at the mercy of the bidding process. You are. And we've seen big increases from 25 million a year to 40 million a year over a seven- or eight-year arch with garbage services. To say well, we've projected it's only going to go up 2 percent and inhouse options up here. Why not project it will go down 2 percent, then the gap will be even bigger. History would show you it's not going up 2 percent a year. So, there isn't going to be a savings here. Finally, if you're concerned about 1.6 million dollars a year difference, 2016, this was inhouse projection...the staff projected this was going to cost 24 million a year. The bids came in at 25.6. It's right there, It's on DMIS, no one blinked an eye, Oh, my god. 1.6 million dollars over the estimate. We can't afford that. But we didn't say that. We didn't say we can't keep going with this contracted out services of 1.6 million dollars more a year, which is exactly what you are looking at here, less here. So, Councillor Santos challenges me to respond to alleviate her concerns. I hope I can do that since she's likely the swing vote on this. We all miss committee meetings now and then. The issues with shift scheduling, you'll notice our recommendation is that we talk to CUPE about that, and they have said they are willing to talk. So, if we can do that, then the cost differential narrows even more if indeed there is any cost differential. So, the motion out of Water and Waste on EPC does address that shift issue. The bulky waste currently isn't picked up by us. So, the reports are saying, well, you couldn't combine them both. I'm not sure if that's true. I think you could have inhouse collection of bulky waste. But right now, it's not done, it's an entirely separate contract. So, this isn't going to make it worse, on whatever the bulky waste pickup is now. The arson thing really is a red herring. The carefully worded original motion said these areas. There is an area that's picked up Thursday and Friday. It's more, it's got a bit of Browaty's ward, it's got a bit of Schreyer's ward. It's left out of the motion, to avoid this very scenario. The staff says, well we looked at the area where we pick up Thursday and Friday. Now we have to pick up (inaudible). If you vote for this, you're pro-arson or words to that effect. Please. The map isn't set in stone; we have been careful to say that. So maybe West Broadway comes in and maybe Schreyer's bit and Browaty's bit fall out. So, we will be able to spread it over several days without violating the current Thursday-Friday protocol for arson. There is a map attached of 2016, that shows the arson area. The proposed map that came out of committee is different, right? This is what we voted on in December. So, then the cost determination. You make a good point, and perhaps we'll have to revisit this, if it all ends up 8-8. You make a good point that isn't there a fee coming out of the budget, where we took garbage off of the property tax and it's all going to be a fee. So, it's going to be a king hell, big fee, much bigger than the existing 50…60. We know that we just added nine to it, for example. So, what's it going to be? We don't know. That report will be forthcoming. But what came out of committee this time wasn't due to compost. It wasn't due to bulky. It wasn't pick up recycling. It was just limited to garbage to try and get some toehold here. So why? Why do this was the challenge? If you've given no reason why to do it. Well, I'll quote Calgary again, a mixed service delivery model could foster competition and lead to a more cost-effective way. If it was all a disaster, why has Ottawa kept it? If it was all a disaster, why has Toronto kept it? If it was all ridiculous. Calgary said geez, we should be all out...but they didn't. Some is in and some is out, and Gilroy spoke very well about she thinks this is the way to go in the inner city. That's the way this was drafted. So, I don't think the additional costs are nearly going to be what's suggested here. I really don't. If they are, even if you accept this at face value, 8 million bucks on a 208-million-dollar program is a pretty small increase, especially when you look back, six or seven years ago and the bids came in higher than estimate anyway. So, I don't know that the private sector is going to go up at 2 percent a year when they have been going up at over 7 percent a year for the last arch of nine years. So, I appreciate your concerns being on the working group. The other unclear thing here is this isn't meant to kick people out now. This is okay, February 1, 2027. What's it going to look like? This says, let's keep some of it inhouse, and the other two zones can be contracted out. So, where will we be on recycle? We don't know. We know we're not going compost from door-to-door several years after that. So, hopefully, I've alleviated some of your concerns on the price. There will be a big, expanded household diversion fee debate coming. So, I hope that alleviates some of the concerns. I think it's not just for the sake of doing it. It's not just for the sake of being left-right. It's for the sake of trying to do something for the inner city. It's for the sake of trying to foster competition to give us some leverage when we go private. But hey, let's end with this. So, what happens after the Golf vote in 2013? You're losing a million dollars a year, we were told on the side of buses. What happened the year after? We started making a million dollars a year when we didn't change things. We kept a mixed model. The current Mayor even asked what about the cost

of the Golf dividend. So, you know, you can get scared into a lot of things here, but I don't think, I mean the Golf history shows pretty well. I don't think it's going to cost us money. It's going it's going to save us money. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, we will vote on the amending motion that's been presented by Councillor Browaty first, and then the main item. Call for recorded vote. All in favour of amending motion two, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Gillingham. Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Duncan, Lukes, Wyatt.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. The amending motion is lost. On to the main item. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Dobson, Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Schreyer.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: The main item is lost. Next item, Madam Clerk.

Councillor Eadie: Then the recommendation of the Standing Committee stands…

Madam Speaker: Pardon me? The item is lost, as I said. There's nothing before us. Next, Madam Clerk. I guess we're done in that section. We'll now have question period under this committee. Councillor Eadie?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, it's a sad state of affairs with garbage. You know, there's a report that came out, the consolidation one. Sounds like oh, everything has worked hey, really good. You know… and the issue of 9 dollars a cart… flat fee. Now, my question, Madam Speaker is, I presented and you know, philosophically, I think it's wrong to think philosophically, but ultimately, the 9-dollar flat fee charged to every household is interesting. But I want to know what has happened since I was on the committee and requested a report on actually how well garbage is working. Specifically, in certain neighborhoods. And, well, in order to determine whether or not to make it a mandatory curbside pickup of compost. So, is the department working on anything to realize that people live in poverty?

Madam Speaker: Question for Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I think I've had a good run with the Water and Waste Department. I think the Director is here. I think the Director cares about people living in poverty. I think we have some…we have some provisions around water bill forgiveness. I think this came out…I feel we have had that debate. I really...sorry. I am not on my best, Councillor Eadie, but thank you for your support on the previous item and some kind words. Yeah. In terms of the compost, I can't say that

there's an active work going on to look at an optout provision. We voted for the somewhat half step forward report that's there. I would still like some clarity about what we really want to be curbside in 2028 or do we still want to avoid costs. Let's go in '30. Let's go in '31. But for today, at least, on the composting, we've invoked the 9-dollar household fee. And stand by, I guess. We'll get a rather lengthy RFP that will determine when we will start building a new facility I suppose with the private sector. You've certainly been audibly consistent in your view there shouldn't be a flat fee. I tend to align more in Gilroy saying I didn't want to ditch the whole thing over the debate of the fee or not. I wish we were going quicker, I guess. We'll see what comes out of the RFP.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move on. The Standing Policy Committee on Community Services. Councillor Duncan, first report.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED JULY 5, 2024

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of July 5, 2025, and move adoption of consent agenda items one through three.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Called to question, one through three. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We have two motions under this committee. First is motion three, moved by Councillor Lukes. Seconded by Councillor Duncan regarding the community incentive grant program By-law. Councillor Lukes. You are asking for suspension of the rules to deal with this item today, it's time sensitive?

Councillor Lukes: Yes, yes.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Councillor Lukes: So, I'll just explain it?

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Lukes is on the motion section now. Your opportunity to introduce a motion.

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Lukes,
Seconded by Councillor Duncan,

WHEREAS on June 27, 2024 Council enacted the Community Incentive Grant Program By-law No. 71/2024 to continue the Community Incentive Grant Program;

AND WHEREAS section 7(1) of the By-law limited the amount that could be approved to an organization to a maximum of $100,000 or 50% of the total cost of the project, including taxes,
whichever is less;

AND WHEREAS amendments to the Community Incentive Grant Program By-law No. 71/2024 are required in order for a CIGP grant in an amount over $100,000 to be approved by Council;

AND WHEREAS the installation of shade structures at La Barriere Park is a very important initiative to provide sun protection at the cricket fields;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. *That Council enact a by-law (draft attached as Appendix A) to amend the Community Incentive Grant Program By-law No. 71/2024 as follows:*

    A. *Add Section 7(4) to the Community Incentive Grant Program By-law No. 71/2024 after Section 7(3) as follows:*

        "7(4) A CIGP grant in an amount over $100,000 may only be approved by Council."

2. That subject to adoption of the amending by-law, funding in the amount of $126,400.00 from the Waverley West Ward Community Incentive Grant Program, be approved to the Manitoba Cricket Association Inc., for the La Barriere Park Shade Structures project.

3. That a Communities Fund Grant (Community Incentive Grant Program criteria) in the amount of $62,454.34 be approved to the Manitoba Cricket Association Inc.

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

Councillor Lukes: Sure. So, this was just brought to my attention by the department. Literally, I guess this was three days ago. I'm using up some of the community incentive grant program funding. When we use up more than 100 thousand dollars for a project, there is no By-law that allows Council to vote on that. In order to have Councillor to vote on an amount over 100,000 dollars, we have to have a By-law in place. So attached to your sheet is a By-law, and the project that I'm bringing forward, actually, the contractors were ready to start. The department realized that we couldn't do this unless we had Council approval. We couldn't get Council approval unless we had a By-law. So now by putting this By-law in place, anyone else that has a CIGP, you still will have to come to Council if it's over 100,000 dollars. But probably due to construction inflation and how things have gone up so much over time. I know at Public Works, we've done this with different projects, allowing a different level of funding approvals. So, this is the motion. It's to have this By-law put in place. And then to allow the project that's over 100,000 dollars to go forward. It's time sensitive because similar to Councillor Mayes with his running track, basically, the bag will be sitting there waiting until we get this approved. It's a very good project. It's three shade structures at Lavaria Park. A lot of funding has come in from different sources, and I'm asking for your support on this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Speakers on this item. Okay. Councillor Lukes, would you like to close, or I can call the question?

Councillor Lukes: Please call the question.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of motion three? Contrary? That's carried. Following up, we have motion four. Moved by Councillor Duncan and seconded by Mayor Gillingham. It's regarding free admission to all City of Winnipeg outdoor pools for the August long weekend. Councillor Duncan, you're requesting a suspension?

Councillor Duncan: Yes, if I could have a suspension of the rules to hear this motion.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of the suspension? Contrary? That's carried. You have the floor, Councillor Duncan to introduce the time-sensitive motion.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
MOTIONS

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Duncan,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Gillingham,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is celebrating it's 150th Anniversary in 2024;

AND WHEREAS a series of events commemorating the 150th Anniversary of the City have been taking place throughout the year;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg residents deserve another opportunity to celebrate Winnipeg 150 with a free refreshing dip in a City of Winnipeg outdoor pool on a hot summer weekend;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That admission to all City of Winnipeg outdoor pools be free of charge from August 3-5, 2024.

2. That the total cost associated with the provision of free admission in the amount of $22,370.38, be funded as follows:

A. $11,185.18 from the Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood Ward Land Dedication Reserve Fund.

B. $11,185.19 funded through the Mayor's Office.

3. That the eligibility criteria for the Land Dedication Reserve Fund be waived in this instance.

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

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This is something we have been working on with Community Services for quite some time now. And with the Council's support here, I think we'll be able to continue to celebrate our Winnipeg 150 with some additional services for Winnipeggers in arguably, the favourite season of the year for Winnipeggers, summer. We would be looking at all eight of our outdoor facilities being free. That includes all heated outdoor pools. Potentially, our most popular pool. I don't want to give anybody too much credit here with having the most popular or not, but that does include the Transcona Aquatic Park that would be free. It's a great opportunity for Winnipeggers to come together. It's an excellent opportunity for our community to celebrate. And most importantly here, this free admission will also help ensure that most residents are able to enjoy a fun-filled weekend with their family and friends. I appreciate the support from the Mayor's Office as well. The funds that will cover this will be from the Mayor's Office and the Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood Land Dedication Reserve Fund. Again, all pools, outdoor pools in Winnipeg will be opened and free to the public August 3rd, 4th, and 5th of the long weekend, should we have Council's support here today.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Any speakers on this item? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just very quickly, Madam Speaker. Sorry, I was trying to listen to my computer at same time. Madam Speaker, I'm just curious as to where the money is identified to come from, to cover off the loss of these fees, which I totally agree…I'm totally in favour of this, Madam Speaker. But I would like to know. The Mayor is the seconder, I would where is the money coming from?

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, I'd also like to rise, like Councillor Eadie said, I'll be supporting this Winnipeg 150. And probably hiring a bus to send it to south St. Boniface so that the residents who can't use Happyland can be bused to Transcona Aquatic Park. And I'd be more than happy to do that probably more often this summer in light of the fact we're doing this, all of us, which is wonderful, but we've completely forgotten about those folks. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Duncan to close or Mr. Mayor. Mayor Gillingham? No. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much. Stay tuned to the City of Winnipeg media channels and email distribution. Just on particulars, for Winnipeg residents on how this will operate to ensure that everyone gets a crack at it. But absolutely, to Councillor Wyatt's point. You know, if communities are looking to get bused into a certain location that they have never been to before. I like the idea of Councillor Wyatt footing a bill to have some of his residents experience and other Winnipeggers experience Transcona's Aquatic Park. So, you can call the question. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Can you read into the record please the funding source.

Councillor Duncan: Yeah, absolutely. Let me pull it up here. That the total cost associated with the provision of free admission in the amount of 22,370.38 dollars be funded as follows. A. 11,185.18 dollars from the Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood ward Land Dedication Reserve Fund. B. 11,185.19 dollars funded through the Mayor's office.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Okay. We'll now move onto By-laws, as a result of the motion that we just passed. We will have a suspension of the rules to deal with the By-law associated with that particular motion. Madam Clerk. No need to read into the record. Councillor Duncan. You request suspension of the rules?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Duncan: Yes. I'd like to move that rules 10.3 of the procedure By-law be suspended in order for Council to consider By-law 92/2024, which was received less than four business days preceding to Council meeting.

Madam Speaker: Is there a need for…okay. I'll call the question on the suspension. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Yes. I'll now move that By-law 92/2024 By-law of the City of Winnipeg to amend the community incentive grant program. By-law 71/2024 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law 92/2024.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much. I'd like to move By-law 92/2024 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law 92/2024.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move the rules be suspended and By-law 92/2024 be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Okay. We'll now get into question period for Councillor Duncan. Any questions for the Chair? Seeing none. Next committee is Standing Policy Committee on Public Works. Councillor Lukes?

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED JULY 3, 2024

Councillor Lukes: Consent agenda of items one through six.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Louise Bridge. Mr. Mayor, did you have your hand up? No, okay. Item two is the only one pulled. I'll call the question on one through five. There is six as well. One, three through six. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried, Councillor Browaty noted in opposition for item six. Madam Clerk?

Item 2 – Louise Bridge Rehabilitation

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

Councillor Lukes: I'll listen to the colleagues, and then I'll close.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. This was stood down by Councillor Wyatt. You have the floor.

Councillor Wyatt: I rise that this was before the committee. It's a decision, which I think is unfortunate, Madam Chair. I know I supported it, because I wanted to get through the amendment, which is attached here, which I appreciate they did. However, the bigger picture, which is not going to be addressed here, is the fact that we did...the City of Winnipeg spent millions of dollars on eastern corridor study, which clearly indicated the need for an expanded Louise Bridge. That would involve new spans, not using the existing alignment. And that what we're being proposed to do here is spend 40 million dollars on an existing bridge that will last us another 20 or 30 years. It doesn't seem to make any sense. We know the growth that's occurred on the east side of the city. This project in and off itself will be a two-year project. It will disrupt traffic and transportation on the east side of the city. Not all of us have the benefit of an eight-lane roadway going into the heart of downtown Winnipeg without rail crossings, without river crossings, like St. James of Assiniboia has. Some of us have to get over a river. Some of us have to get over railways. And we know from the experience that went on, that took place when Disraeli was done, Councillor Browaty will recall and some others here, that it's very disruptive. It has a huge impact on the surrounding bridges. And frankly, it could have been avoided...this could have been avoided if we had the courage and wisdom to set aside the funds necessary to make the investments called for in the very study that this Council spent millions to commission, and now it's putting on the shelf. No sense whatsoever. If we are truly a growing city, if we are truly confident about the future of Winnipeg, then why aren't we making these strategic decisions and new strategic

infrastructure, which we know have to be addressed? Indeed. The rapid transit part of this corridor is a huge part. To have a new dedicated corridor. The plans and the importance, this is also to Point Douglas, North Point Douglas, north of the highline, in particular, to address and alleviate traffic in the neighborhood, as well as reduce traffic in other parts of south Point Douglas is important and identified in the report. And as well as to address future transportation needs, such as the the future (inaudible) line, not just the eastern corridor but the (inaudible) line north into north Kildonan, and east Kildonan, all of this is related to growth, and what your vision is for the future of the city. If you believe that the city is not really going to grow, if you believe that...what I heard at committee which kind of surprised me, is the administration saying well actually less and less people want to come downtown now. If you believe that downtown is in decline, or will continue to decline, if you believe that we're not going to see Winnipeg be a success in the future, then yes. This report makes sense. But if you believe the opposite, if you believe in a vision of the city that we need to invest in new strategic infrastructure, that in and off itself will spur more growth and development and success in the city. People come to our city for opportunity, to improve their lot in life. This does not improve their lot in life. This is going to be standing back, not doing anything, holding the fort for another 30 years, just to pass the buck, by the way, down to a future Council who will then have to face the cost, which will be exponentially more. Thanks to Councillor Schreyer's construction inflation, that he is so worried about, and so Madam Chair, why did we spend the millions on these? Why? And why is the administration so eager to just accept this option, frankly? Where is the leadership from our senior management? They should be pushing back. Or maybe they have, and they were pushed down by EPC I don't know, I'm not at the table either. I don't know what goes on there. I have been in the past and have seen those battles, but I doubt it. I doubt it. This is something, Madam Chair that any Director worth his salt in Public Works wouldn't have signed off on. This is about the future of not just northeast Winnipeg, but if we start doing this with every major initiative, why aren't we putting Kenaston on hold? Why aren't we putting Chief Peguis on hold? Why don't we just start shuting down the projects, because really, no, we don't need to over the river her, we can just fly over it, I guess. Well Mary Poppins is playing at Rainbow Stage. But anyway, that's just coincidence. But Madam Speaker, this is a project that should be going...at least build the lines for the transit corridor, so at least you can get the buses out of the existing congestion that exists on the weaves on any given date, or the congestion that's growing on Provencher on any given day, or the congestion trying to get onto the Disraeli overpass at the yield that was built without any off ramp or acceleration, deceleration. You know, at least do that. But that's not even being contemplated here. And so, we're left with a project that we're going to now spend 40 million dollars on just to extend the life of a bridge that we are then going to decommission. Just listen to what I just said. We're spending 40 million dollars of public money to extend the life of a bridge we are now decommissioning. That makes no sense. And I would suggest to you the city fathers and city mothers as a whole, who had vision, would have not gone down this road. They would have set aside sinking funds. They would have set aside a reserve account, they would have explained to the citizens of Winnipeg, yes, we might have to increase taxes a bit more for this reserve account, but this is what you're going to get, and this is when you're going to get the bridge. And by the way, we need to make investments in Chief Peguis, we need to make investments in Kenaston. We need to sort out what's going on Bishop Grandin right now, or sorry Abinojii Mikanah. We have to do that as well. We have to invest in Lagimodiere, right, any traffic light on Lagimodiere this time a day is packed, right through the next intersection. You think Kenaston is bad, go take a drive to Lagimodiere right now. The whole city is slowly, you know, don't think that we can't go the way of Toronto. When Toronto started to rest on its laurels in the 1980s, after they spent money in the 60s and 70s building transit and freeways and subways. And then they sat back for 20 years. And now Toronto has the longest commute times of any western city in the western world. Average of 60 minutes. And the plan that they have to get out of it is to spend tens of billions, hundreds of billions, just to maintain, I think it's a 58-minute average commute time. That's how far beyond they are. So, let's not think that can't happen here, or that people will vote with their feet, which they are slowly starting to do, which is into the Capital region, so they can just avoid the congestion. And what you'll see next is office buildings and office towers on the edge of the city. It will happen, and that's my concern, and that's called a hollowing out of a city. It's a phenomenon that's happened elsewhere many times. So, either we get with the solution, or the problem will overcome us. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, northwest and northeast Winnipeg are dependent on the Louise Bridge, and will be quite dependent on what the supposed, well, what the currently planned future is to be, Madam Speaker. But I just want to start off by just reminding...because Louise Bridge, I see it as partly mine. Just like the Arlington Bridge. It's partly mine. What I don't want to happen, is for the Louise Bridge to experience what Arlington Bridge is going through at the moment. Some would argue, well, the Louise Bridge is much more needed than the Arlington Bridge. But ultimately, then you have to say what is the possibility of the Transit Master Plan. It's eastern rapid transit corridor, bus rapid transit corridor with the need of that bridge. I don't think we need the 80 bridge personally, because there's already an 80 bridge by Disraeli, and it's only two blocks from Strathcona and Nairn. Just along mid-winter. So, Madam Speaker, the reality is this. I would like, you know, to replace the Arlington Bridge and have something fully functional. The Transit, we went through and we got federal funding, and what's the escalated cost of building the new north garage? Holy, just their investment. So, to do the rapid transit bridge, whatever, Madam Speaker, like transit, where is the money? And the Arlington Bridge does need to be repaired. Some people say the guesstimate is in September, we're going to be looking at 125 million dollars. That's a guesstimate. Not a any real class yet. It better be a class three, when it's presented to us because, Arlington Bridge is in

deathly need. So, 40 million to help the Louise Bridge last another 20, 25 years, which is probably about the time that we'll be doing the eastern rapid transit corridor. So, I don't see a problem with this. Yeah, it would be great if we can do all the real needed projects that we have, but I mean, financially, the way things are working, yeah, we're proceeding with Kenaston or whatever. I prefer proceeding with other things. But Madam Speaker, the reality is, we need to vote for the Public Service to get this bid opportunity out before construction inflation hits. You build a new one or whatever. But ultimately, I don't know if steel prices are going up a lot or what's going on and I believe the piers for the Louise Bridge need some repair there as well. The only thing that I worry about, Madam Speaker on moving forward with this, they did that with what was then called the Redwood Bridge, now the Harry Lazarenko Bridge. They redid it. They had a budget. They said oh, well, after inspecting it and everything, we said, I think it was, I don't know, I can't remember the exact dollars, but it was somewhere around ten or 12 million. It ended up…they have to do more work doing the steel, than they ever thought. And actually, it ended up being almost, I think it was double. I'm just saying, 40 million is in this report. That's going to turn into something more, I am pretty sure. So, Madam Speaker, the faster we can move on this and get it done, maybe the less it increases. But we've got to make sure that it's been studied properly to know exactly what the repairs are, and what it's going to cost to do. So anyway, thanks, Madam Speaker. I encourage all of you to vote for this. We don't want the Louise Bridge to turn into the Arlington Bridge. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Before my eyes, we're living in an era where we're not really willing to recognize where our money losses are. We just won't talk about it, we're in denial. And here we are paying the piper. Or not. Because we don't seem to have the money to replace a couple of the oldest essential bridges in the city. That's some, I guess, in what other cities does this happen? Two now. And I'm a witness here to it. But again, I'm a little worried. We have...our perception of left and right and what is left? What is right? What is affordable? We're still going to have to pay the piper on this, and we're seeing things like not being able to replace old central bridges that were 100 years old. In our last vote, trying to have a little bit of moderation, something left-wing, about having one-fifth of our city, where the garbage and recycling is picked up by city workers. It's not a left-wing thing. It's just not as right-wing is all. Trying to go somewhere towards a balance. It's a moderation. And we missed it. That was an opportunity for moderation, some moderation, some balance, some checks and balances. But we pay for these things. We pay for these things over years, over decades. And I don't think every city has made the same mistakes that we have. No. They have gone for moderation. They have gone for balance. They have gone for accepting the fact that we can't continue in the status quo. It's not working. And yeah, it's not just about externalities, external factors, it's decisions we make. We're here making decisions, so yeah, our decisions are important. If you say, there's no cause and effect between our decisions and our budget. Well, we just had an opportunity to figure that out like every other major city in Canada, we didn't. So where are we? We're not in a moderate place. We're not in an essential, balanced, moderate position here.

Councillor Orlikow: Madam Speaker, is this about the Louise bridge?

Councillor Schreyer: It's about budget. Isn't the bridge vote about budget? Is it just about priorities? Or we're not able to fulfil our priorities because of our budget? Isn't this the City that spent its reserve funds? Isn't that who we are? Our reserve funds are gone. Right? I'm talking about the Louise Bridge. Didn't we, we don't have any reserve funds left. We talked about the Louise Bridge and our priorities. Okay, we don't have to talk about the Louise Bridge. We can talk about other priorities other than Louise Bridge. There are some things that others consider more important. That's okay, I suppose. You see, I just happened to note, as an example, and Madam Speaker, I'm looking at this more as an observer, because throughout my nine years on Council, I actually voted in favour of whatever Council proposal there was in terms of what would be on the short list for federal funding. And that, when it didn't include the Louise Bridge, I voted for it anyway. Or what I can tell you, is that the priorities of our city that this Council voted for kept changing the nine years I've been here. It just keeps changing. Now the thing about the Louise Bridge, I mean, I was, before I had any clue of being a city Councillor, the issue of the Louise Bridge was already there in 2006, that was the first report that came up when Lillian Thomas, as a City Councillor, and then Thomas Steen referred to that, when he was the City Councillor for Elmwood-East Kildonan, he referred to that report that came out before even he knew he would be the City Councillor for Elmwood-East Kildonan. And, because we knew for 20 years that this was coming up. So, to me, I'm not saying this is the most important issue. I've been going along with Council for years in terms of what the priorities are. When the bridge is now deemed it needs tens of millions, what, 40-60 million dollars in renovation and rehabilitation, in order to maintain it for another generation. While I voted for the city's proposed new transit system and the eastern corridor. I voted in favour of this stuff. And then once again, rather than dealing with the reality, which we knew were coming up for decades. I can say well 18 years that something would have to happen with the Louise Bridge. Here we are, saying we're going to scrap that, which it wasn't my proposal. I just voted for it. I supported Council's priorities. But they keep changing yet again. I know we're seeing this because there is other more important things to do or we don't have the budget. I understand these things will go…always, your priorities are a function of your budget. How much can you get done? So, what I've supported with my fellow Councillors is being scrapped yet again. Sort of a rather well-developed plan for east Winnipeg, northeast Winnipeg, and I would say it's a function of the budget. Now I really, well, I am obliged to say bear in mind, we're looking at

streamlining and efficiencies, and opening up Portage and Main, well, you know, where this is going to be a closure of a bridge, for which there will be no…when you make a new bridge and keep the old one open, my understanding is that was possible. So, we would maintain that to traffic fluidity. That won't be the case here, they are going to have to close the bridge, rather than keep it open during construction of what we've known for 20 years...we would need a new bridge. In 1880, "O, Canada" was first performed. John A. MacDonald was Prime Minister; John Norquay was Premier. Louis Riel got married and a gunfight took place near the o.k. corral. Why do I mention this? That's how old the old the piers are to the bridge, that's how old they are. So, we knew this day was coming for a long time. I'm amazed…apparently, I'm told here that those piers are still in use, that's how old this bridge is. That's how long we knew we had to replace it. And we've also known for years that there was a strategy for transportation and transit to go along with the new bridge. These things have to be scrapped, because well, we spent our reserve funds, and we're pretending we're being efficient, when we can't even be moderate and have checks and balances in our system, for which we and we alone are responsible. Not externalities, us.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Lukes, your close, please.

Councillor Lukes: Yeah, I just want to rise and point to the report. I mean, I'm not a traffic engineer, but it says that the traffic analysis suggests that the existing two-lane bridge will provide adequate capacity until around 2050. And that at that point, the bridge could be expanded for rapid transit. So basically, what they are saying is the rehabilitation of the existing bridge will provide a minimum of 30 years of additional life service. So, taking all things into consideration of the funding that we have and what we're doing in the city, versus the cost of building a new one. I'm supportive of this and I'm hoping others are, too.

Madam Speaker: Question. All in favour of item two? Contrary? That's carried. Onto By-laws.

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

Councillor Lukes: I'd like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law number 96/2024. By-law 97/2024. 98/2024. 99/2024. 100/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law 96/2024, By-law 97-2024, By-law 98/2024, By-law 99/2024. And By-law 100-2024.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, And I'd like to move the By-law 96/2024 to By-law 100/2024 both inclusive to read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws 96/2024 to By-law 100/2024 both inclusive.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, I'd like to move that the rule be suspended and that By-laws 96/2024 to 100/2024 both inclusive, be read a third time, and the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Lukes. Okay. Seeing none. Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DATED JULY 5, 2024

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of July 5, 2024, and move item one as consent.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period under this committee. Any questions? Councillor Eadie.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In reviewing the Finance committee's full agenda, this was the previous Friday. I can't remember when, two Fridays ago. Madam Speaker, I was looking at the projections, and there's a report saying we're not transferring money from the general revenue into the fiscal stabilization fund. And I just wanted to confirm that, so the projections so far, is it true that the corporate efficiency contrary revenue account, we're not going to be able to meet, or the Public Service is not going to be able to meet those corporate efficiencies. Is that why?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much for the question. It's actually a very good question. As Councillor Eadie was on the budget working group, you may recall that the multiyear budget is balanced. In fact, in 2024, there was actually a small surplus forecast, and shortfalls in subsequent years in terms of the operating side, the general fund. So as a result, the original plan was…this year, the expectation was a surplus to balance out future years. So, the budget working group this year will have to make, they will have to figure out how to make up that shortfall.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's…Councillor Orlikow?

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. I emailed you a while back, regarding some concerns I had, regarding the housing accelerator fund, and the lack of financial data on that, which I will get into later on. I haven't received a response back from you on that. I mentioned it even at the committee level, that I was hoping to do that. Is there a problem with actually looking at the actual accounting of, including the loss of LDR, including the loss of administrative revenues. Is there a reason why I haven't heard a response yet or should I just follow up with a motion at the next Finance meeting?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty?

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. I apologize. I do see the email came through on June 24th. I apologize that a receipt hasn't come yet, I did forward it on to some people for some insight. I will get back to you before the end of the month.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions. Let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee. Councillor Wyatt? Property and Development.

Councillor Wyatt: Though, I'd love to stay and enjoy the rest of the meeting with my colleagues, July the 18th is also one of my son's birthdays. Thomas is turning 17, and we have a party to get to. So, I just want to let the chamber know I'm leaving for that purpose. Yes.

Madam Speaker: You're going at this time?

Councillor Wyatt: I'm leaving now. Yes. I understand it's also Councillor Duncan's birthday today.

Madam Speaker: His child's birthday.

Councillor Wyatt: Oh okay, very good. Well, congratulations as well, to Councillor Duncan.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, Just I haven't noted, we're on the committee. We're going to have some conflicts if you want to declare those.

Councillor Wyatt: Oh yes, thank you to the clerk for reminding me of that. He's got them noted. Do I need to note them? Okay, thanks.

Madam Speaker: It's item seven. Extension of time on a rezoning on Harold Avenue.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, item seven on the report of July 4th, item 12 of the report or sorry, item 16, the same report. July 4th PP&D, and By-law 85/2024.

Madam Speaker: And the reason?

Councillor Wyatt: Pecuniary.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, our Chair, on the report please.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JULY 4, 2024

Councillor Rollins: I'd like to introduce the report and move consent agenda items one to 16, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: One, two, and I'm not sure is there an amending motion coming for ten?

Madam Speaker: There is not. Oh, yes, there is, actually. There is. So, motion ten, item ten will be stood down. You've requested one, sale of city-owned buildings, and item two, the real estate policy framework. I'll call the question on the others. Three through nine, 11 and 12, 13 through 16, and that's it. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – The Sale of City-owned Buildings to Non-Profit Tenants

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: I'd just like to open, Madam Speaker, and say that this recommendation that we're voting on is for the Public Service to be directed to negotiate with existing nonprofit tenants, that is set out in the appendix of the leasing and licencing of property policy, who are interested in purchasing the building. So, they have expressed an interest, Madam Speaker, and they have got their hand up, and they are going, it is to direct the Public Service to say go for it and have that conversation. Then, the next one is to really look at the recommendation of declaration of surplus and sale of property, to be waived so that the Public Service can be authorized to negotiate a direct sale with the existing tenants, who's leased the building from the city. I've asked for a line of sight of this. So, it is a, and I want to thank my colleagues, who have appreciated the Standing Policy Committee process during this meeting in their speech making, and so I've asked for a line of sight in this. The committee endorsed it. I've also, you know, oftentimes, expressed caution and to make sure that people are not surprised, and I have every faith the department is talking to as many stakeholders to make that happen. So, with that, I'll open it. I'm in support. I think Council should be as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I will be, I guess I'll vote. I'll have to decide. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to speak to this report. And I appreciate the Chairperson had the administration. There was an inaccessible table inside of the report, and the information was sent to me in an accessible format. And I was just reviewing it. Now Madam Speaker, I don't, it's how Property and Development and frankly, a lot of other people think, what is it a not-for-profit group who is incorporated, or whatever? So, when I see, like I know there's properties that people are seeking that would like to buy it, who are actually occupying it. But when we look at Real Estate, and we look at our say, museums. So, in there, it' listed, it still says that they are a not-for-profit group, somehow not part of the city. Now you need to know at least two museums, and most of the others have boards that are fully appointed, or a majority appointed by Council. Through a process. They are not a non-city, not-for-profit entity. They are actually a group, a board that we put together to manage our heritage programs related to the museums. So, when I was looking at this list before, I see this stuff and I go, you know, like Lake House is an interesting one where you have a senior's group, they are not…none of them are appointed by the City of Winnipeg. But, you know, anyway, other property assets, when I see this stuff. You know, you got to fix this. Because it's just I find it quite ridiculous, right? That we say that there's somehow a separate, non-city, not-for-profit organization. I'll leave it there. But you know, I am going to vote for the report, I mean, they didn't ask certain groups, but I know in the past they asked the curator of the Seven Oaks House Museum. Do you want to buy it? The board. You know, technically a biz is a city entity, to a certain degree, created through By-law, right? We're not even allowed to own property. Real property. But then we asked a board fully appointed us By-laws that they are really approving, how they operate, but...those have to be presented. So, Madam Speaker, anyway, I just think when Property and Development, Real Estate is looking at these things. We need to, you know, it's a …we are not going to ask Community Services, they are city owned, wholly city-owned buildings. Although, we don't appoint the boards. But I just wanted to mention that. And then, you know, the ability to purchase a building. In Pritchard Park there's a building. In Boyd Park, there's an old Community Centre now,

(inaudible) building, I think they did offer to the Panam Boxing Club to purchase that. I don't know what they said, but that building needs a lot of work. So, Madam Speaker, I don't know why I would buy it, personally. Anyway, I'll leave it at that. I will vote for the report. I just…the way we look at things, I think it's not proper. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Rollins to close.

Councillor Rollins: Question, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour, item one? Contrary? That's carried. Madam Clerk, item two.

Item 2 – Amendments to the Real Estate Framework

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins?

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, creating affordable housing opportunities in housing improvement zones was approved by Council in January. And when we got to the committee, we had a really good talk about what the requirements were, and what would be more flexible with respect to the delegated authority to the CAO to accept and approve donations. Now, many of us would be familiar with the scenario that we had before us of the Manitoba habitat conservancy. And motions that the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development looked at through the support of Council. In order to have and speed some of that up, this is a bit that. Also, there are other scenarios, where we transfer land to Habitat for Humanity, for instance. That is having a build come up in August that the public might want to take advantage of if they want to learn some building skills and volunteer for that great organization. But transferring the land takes time. And so, this is providing some really needed delegate authority of the Chief Administrative Officer to approve donations and acquisition of land, of nominal amounts from folks and also to, you know, again, we'll have another line sight on having the required amendments of the Real Estate framework for authorizing that. And allowing for future acceptance of land donations and/or acquisitions from conservation organizations. So, these are some recommendations to look at the Real Estate policy. It's important that we had a very good discussion about HIZ zones. And we did work on some amendments with respect to that accordingly, that I supported. And so, I want to thank the committee for their thoughtful work, as always.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I actually had this stood down. At the surface, I see no problem with this. But Madam Speaker, when we start looking at changing real estate policy, some of us Councillors went through an awful time. And there was a real estate audit done, and there was a whole list of recommendations to change what the city was doing. One of them was we contract for a fairness commissioner, and the city auditor was monitoring the number of actions that had to be taken regarding how we deal with real estate. What I don't see in this report anywhere, is did the fairness commissioner we have to look over the policy or the auditor to make sure that we're not going back to some old ways that led to all the shenanigans? Let's call it whatever. So, I am a little…I think it needs to be reviewed by the auditor and/or the fairness commissioner in terms of, probably the auditor, in terms of, you know, is it taking away from all the changes that were done, to protect with the public purse. That's all.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins to close.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I'll say this. You know, we do have reports, this changes nothing with respect to the Council directed policy that we did most recently together, and I think it was either the beginning of this term or the end of last term with respect to the fairness commissioner. And in fact, you can see the report of the independent fairness commissioner on a couple of agenda items, in particular, the proposed surplus decoration of De Rossier and the Canterbury properties. So, I take this does not change anything related to that, and in fact, throughout the PP&D agenda, you can still see the report of the independent fairness commissioner in compliance with sale of surplus declarations that you'll see. What it does do is allow us to transfer more expeditiously. It doesn't mean that the fairness commissioner won't be doing their reports. It doesn't change anything with respect to that. What it does do is…yeah. I'll just leave it at that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on item two. All in favour? Contrary? It's carried. Next item.

Item 10 – Establishment of a Development Fee or Charge associated with the Housing Accelerator Fund

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins to introduce the item, then we'll hear from Councillor Orlikow on his amending motion.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. There is work. And I want to harken back to a quote from Councillor Eadie, where he said with respect to Property and Development we've got to fix it. And it was related to the first item, not this item. But with respect to the direction to the Public Service to report back in 180 days with options for the establishment of a development fee or charge that complies with the July 8, 2020, ruling. The ruling of the Manitoba Court and then Queen's Bench with respect to the fact that the City can impose a fee, but in particular to the By-law that had been enacted by the previous previous Council. How those who paid the fee directly benefited, it was determined to be a tax. So, I have made commitments, on the record, of where the focus is, in Property and Development. I, of course, am one vote on Council. But that focus is definitely the rezoning. It's definitely making sure that we have our highest best use for land. It's definitely the housing accelerator fund, which has its own timing imposed on us, and as per our agreement that we've agreed on at Council. And I anticipate grants getting out the door ASAP in the fall. I believe the department is working very fast and very hard on a number of plans and priorities that this Council has put before them. And one of the commitments that I made externally in addition to that, was that the next focus would be to make sure that we provided certainty, whether you are a not-for-profit housing developer building deeply affordable housing, or a developer that wants to perhaps build more condos in the ward I represent, multimillion dollar condos in Wellington, that we would have an answer with respect to where the capacity is and isn't in the city because we keep butting against that every time we develop. So, Madam Speaker, while plans and priorities are absolutely can change and be dictated by this room, I want to state that as Standing Policy Committee Chair, it's just not the priority and plan I would advance on behalf of Council. I am currently paid a little bit more, by the Mayor, than my average day-to-day duties as a protected ward voice to be the city-wide Council that provides policy advice up to Council. And my best policy advice is not this term. Not this term, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Eadie: I'll move that we go past six p.m.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for that. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Orlikow, your opportunity to speak to the main item and your amending motion five.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Orlikow,
Seconded by Councillor Dobson,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 10 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated July 4, 2024, be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendation 1 and replace with the following:*

  "1. That the Public Service be directed to report back in 180 days with options for the establishment of a development fee or charge that complies with the July 8, 2020 Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench ruling on development fees.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. This has been a journey, I must say. It was kind on my own, I had a few conversations with people, we adapted it. But it was a journey, we came off to the housing accelerator fund as my Councillor and colleague, Councillor Eadie says. My PTSD from those years goes to follow the money, okay? That happened. I wasn't happy about the vote. Mostly in the neighborhoods losing their voice, other things are fine. As for a little adjustment, I guess it wasn't time for that, either. But I thought it would be this conditional use, rather then as of right. I see now that we're looking at as of right, pretty well across the board. So again, that battle was won, lost, fair enough. But again, I put this motion forward to say, okay so, one of the things that we talked about the housing accelerator fund is, people are calling me and saying what's in it for me? What's in it for me? You know what, you're going to be able to fill up your schools, have more kids in the playgrounds, you are going to have all this great stuff. Can't pay for it, because we are losing money every day. But again, we didn't get that either, so. I don't really know how to answer, so let me try to answer that for you today. So, what I have done is, again, when I said make sure it complies to the ruling is, make sure it's legal. Let's make sure it's legal before we go too far down the line. So again, maybe words do matter. I made a boo-boo on that a bit. I admit it. Because everybody said, oh, it's an impact fee? Oh my God, you are doing another impact fee? No, I'm not. Because it's a fee or a charge. It doesn't say impact fee anywhere. But again, that's another roadblock that I can't even really get anybody to speak to me about, especially, I had a little moment to speak to the Mayor about it. And even the Mayor said, okay, I see some of the problems, and I commit to helping you trying to work on it at a later date. As Councillor Rollins said sometime in the future. Well, the future is a long time away. So, what I've pretty well done

is simply to tell everybody. Developers right now, because of the as of right, and the conditional use, and all of that stuff, I tracked it up. I took all the different changes and Councillor Rollins was gracious enough to take my grit, and take it as her own, but that's fine. If you have the patience to say, we have lost this with already underlying lots. We have twoplexes, triplexes, and then I had to do a little bit of guessing on the fourplexes, again, these are my estimates and also guessing on quarters that I don't know yet. But bottom line, if you get rid of a rezoning and you get rid of subdivisions, or yeah, subdivisions, you can't…LDR cannot be collected. We don't have a vehicle. Well, great. I guess my motion is ahead of its time. This is perfect now. Now we can do an LDR plus. You can look at that. How much are developers saving? How much are they getting? Because now this isn't even including all the time they are spending on having to do public hearings, none of that. Just what is the administration? So, we have 14-thousand-dollar base fee for rezonings, couple of variants, and we have the LDR...25,000 dollars per application. I'm sure it's more. I sent the document over to PP&D, I haven't heard back. I tried the get some information from Finance, couldn't get there. So, these are the documents, and I have all that information, the Mayor's office has all the information. I have it all. I'm more than happy to share it. but that's what's worth, it's about 25,000 dollars a application. Again, they have to do some variances still, so, it's around there. And I know quarters are a lot more, but it's hard to do that, because I don't know what we're actually doing yet. Bottom line is, Councillors, you are going to lose the LDR, period. There's no question about that. There is nothing to say that we…no one is denying it. How much? I don't know. Is it 10 dollars? Is it a thousand dollars? Is it a million dollars? I have it at 1.5 million dollars per year, on LDR, spread all over the city. And that's not all the application fees. That's just what I took, 700 applications. I took 300. Really trying to be conservative. I'm not trying to blow this out of the water here. Developers even with a plus or minus they are going to save 5, 6 million dollars per year. That money that is not going to come to us anymore. So I go, what a perfect opportunity. No new money, we're just going to reallocate existing money. It's not a new fee, so we don't have to get the minister of housing in Ottawa all in a tizzy. It's just for reallocating money that is already there. And it ensures that we all get the LDR and maybe a little bit more. So, I've said 15 thousand dollars. That's nice. Flat fee. So again, some will say well, you're going to impact infills. No, I'm not. Let's just focus on the ones on the housing accelerator funds, that will be corridors, mature neighborhoods and malls. Let's just focus on those, so we are not going to do infills, so it's not an impact fee. I've sent everybody a really cool video, if you saw it. I quite enjoyed it...a little doodle video, just trying to explain this one and it's pretty simple. You have a choice. You can either go this way, and give all the savings and money to developers, or we can take some of that money and put it into our parks. Put it into our benches. Put it into free weekend water. I don't care. Put it into tracks, stuff that we do need. But we know that day after day, because of our budget problems, LDR is getting taxed more and more. I've got wading pools that I'm spending 90 thousand dollars of LDR and I am getting about 40 thousand dollars from the budget. Super, but at least I have the LDR still. I'm not going to have that much going forward. Again, it's a basic bottom line. And I'm not saying what the charge should be because I'm not the expert. I have talked to the administration about it. What I'm saying is 180 days. I'm not sure why this isn't a priority, to make sure that our neighborhoods can actually fund the parks and the green spaces that we have. To me, that is a huge priority. That's a very big priority. So, we can now go out with our four-plexes, and our four stories and malls and our corridors, and our neighborhoods. People ask me, what's in it for me? I go, well, we'll get some more investment in the neighbourhood through an LDR. That's wonderful to be able to say that. Right now, all I have to say in the next rounds of these public hearings, you're actually going to have to just suck it up buttercup. There is no money coming to you on this. You're actually going to lose money. Pretty heart sell feature, I would say, it actually does promote infill. It's not taking all the infill away from developers, Again, I'm not even setting the fee, I am just pointing (inaudible) if you had the time to look at the video. A couple of Councillors reached out to me and asked these questions. So, consider it LDR-plus. I called it community investment fee, but it's an LDR plus. And that...actually what I really liked about the impact fee and the legal ruling was, that you have to show direct benefit to where the development is happening. LDR does that. You can define it a little bit more. I don't care. Again, I just want to have a report back to say, you know what, this is the time. People say, well we can do this later. But now I've been told through a conversation two weeks ago, fortuitous just by me walking into the wall a few times, that if you're going to do this type of stuff, based on the rezoning and HAF stuff, you have to do it now. And we just approved it now. So, we have to do this now, or it gets very complicated at a later date. It may not be because we're tagging it to a rezoning change. I'm not a lawyer. But again, if we just ask for the report. Again, we all need our LDR. We all need a little bit more LDR. If we're going to start downloading all the parks responsibility to LDR, which I had to tear down a community centre derelict building through LDR. Why would be an LRD thing? It never was in the past. But now it is. So, that's the way it works. I got it. But the money will be shrinking. Should developers get a 5-million-dollar gift from the City of Winnipeg? Do you think that's going to lower housing prices? 15 thousand dollars. Oh, housing bubble (inaudible). Housing prices, we have to make sure they are affordable. 15 thousand dollars is not going to impact at all; it's all going to go to developer profit. Tell me otherwise…I mean, that's why I wanted to go first, so you could tell me otherwise. It's not going to go anywhere else but into their pockets, which is fine. It's a business. They want to make profit. No problem, that's the only profit margins they have, really in development, everything else is pretty well-fixed costs. So again, that's why I said, don't take it all. Give them some, you know? So, we can balance this all off. So that's why I brought this forward. That's why I spent the time to do a video. That's why the time I took to listen, but the time is now, the opportunity is now. If not, in a few years that we may consider later on. If you want to pass the rest of the housing accelerator fund easily, if you want to make sure you can invest into our neighborhoods, you want to protect the LDRs, so we are not losing the LDR. Now is the time just to ask for a report back in 180 days. This other stuff about strategic infrastructure, that I've been on those committees before. They are slow, and you know what, UDI? I

don't work for UDI. I also don't work for auto. I work for the residents of the River Heights-Fort Garry ward, and I have to tell them, you are losing money with this one. That's what I have to tell them. And they are. And I am not lying, because I have the evidence right in front of me. So again, I'm just asking to look at this, 180 days. Maybe I'm way off. I talked to the Director. I talked to the (inaudible) about the idea. They actually steered me; it could be a community fee. It could be an area charge. There are a number of other ideas in this. But we can't be trying to go forward with telling everybody that all of this is great. All of this infill is wonderful and guess what? You get to lose money. That's not a great selling feature. I still don't know how the City of Winnipeg is going to handle the 5 plus million dollars of less administration fees that we are going to have. Again, the departments didn't seem to see a problem, I don't know how, but ok, it's 5 million dollars a year out of your budget, good luck. So, can I speak for two more minutes?

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

Councillor Orlikow: I know people got to…about the impact fees. And some people, the Mayor, really did not like impact fees a long way back when. I appreciate his support back then through it. And it really was clear. If I was on EPC, I would have never voted for it. He went along with it; he did bring it up. But I also did it when I was on EPC, didn't bring this matter forward. I just talked to the Mayor, we talked about a lot. As a team player, I did a wind-up...I understand why some people don't vote for it. But you have to understand, you are losing LDR, developers are getting a very good profit out of this now and not much is coming back to the city. That's my opinion. So again, I am open to other ideas. I always have been and tried to reach out. I had one meeting and I couldn't tend to. It went on until 4 o'clock. I was hoping to get a lay over, so I can talk about this more, they denied, that's prerogative to the Chair, the Committee, that could happen. So, I am here today, I tried to talk to the Mayor's Office, we had a brief talk. I had one of the Mayor's staff come down and say John, what are you doing? That's not really so, and certainly, I never got a response back, so I am here today, I am here today in front of all Council, saying, I don't want to lose my LDR I don't think you wants to lose the LDR. There is an opportunity now in decreasing the fees, not to raise a new fee, not to charge more, this is the perfect opportunity to do it today, just to get a report back. So, I will leave it at that…yeah, that's it. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Mayes…and the Mayor.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. As at EPC, I will support this. I don't know what the answer is on the LDR. But the concern is valid, which if we aren't doing individual hearings, so there is going to be one massive king hail giant zoning meeting under bucket three, I think, I'm losing track of the buckets here, but we are going to be under bucket three when we go next spring, (inaudible) timeline from staff, Director Boyce has been pretty consistent on that. I think, next spring, the fourplexes everywhere, that almost everyone voted for, which various people are now telling me, shouldn't fit in their wards, but, it's going to be everywhere because I was the, subject to whatever limits we put on it, so it will be an interesting session on that, but if we do rezone and maybe we need to have this debate even sooner, with the malls and corridors. We will have one big hearing event, Councillor Orlikow was right, there will be a pubic hearing, not multiples, there will be a public hearing, and then the matter will be done, so yeah, the ability to get Land Dedication from individual developments will be lost, so we need some mechanism, I don't care what it is called, we need some mechanism to be able to say to people, yeah, there's this big new development in your neighborhood. But the developer's contributing something, they are doing this. So, I appreciate the effort being put in here, by Councillor Orlikow, the...I feel I've lived through this because I remember getting lectured once by a planner upstairs. It might have been James Platt, but he corrected himself, Platt is a good guy. But we were at the Mayor's Office getting sneered at saying where you get all that LDR from all that stuff in Glenwood, and I said, no actually I haven't got a dime, because none of it is subdivision, it's all just lots splits, it's not even lot splits…it's just pre-existing lots and people some in. It's all variances, 140 in a row, recommended by the staff, most of them passed, never got a dime for LDR, never got anything out of it. So that, let me tell you, upsets the neighbourhood. So, if we're able to keep the mechanism, where we have something the development community is still contributing, well, I don't care what it's called. But it's at least worth trying, at least worth having it in mind even if this doesn't pass today, let's have that in our minds. Whenever we get to bucket 2.53 at the malls and corridors, and bucket three of the fourplexes everywhere votes. We need to have something. Otherwise, I think Councillor Orlikow is right. There will be a massive windfall for the development community. I don't think they are lobbying for that, so there's got to be some way of coming up with a mechanism, so if there is significant development Councillor Gilroy quite accurately pointed out, Madam Speaker, your work on the Gateway one, I think it was. No, not the Gateway. Getting tired here. The other one.

Madam Speaker: Northgate.

Councillor Mayes: Northgate...close. You got them to do some stuff. Really that's what this is saying. We need the ability to get developers to do some stuff. So, I'm supportive, and I hope we're able to work out something by the time we get to bucket two and a half.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Next is the Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. I'll be quick. Through you, Madam Speaker. I did indicate to Councillor Orlikow, I'd like to, at EPC, I'd like to work with him. It won't be my staff members; I'd like to sit down with Councillor Orlikow and work with him on this. I ultimately want, as I said at EPC, us to find a way that we can maintain the LDR equivalent in some way. It's the same ultimate goal I think that all Council staff, certainly Councillor Orlikow has, and Councillor Mayes has as well. I can appreciate the value of LDR. I used it myself. Obviously, as a city councillor, so I do appreciate it. And still believe that it needs to be that contribution or equivalent in some manner by the developers, even as we're making these changes. I'm not going to support getting the report back in 180 days. As I said, consistent with what I said at the Executive Policy Committee. I'd like the opportunity to meet with the Councillor and maybe others to figure out a path that we could maybe do this without jeopardizing, without jeopardizing access to the federal funds that are available, being made available, both the housing accelerator fund, and the future chunks of it, and the 6 million dollar infrastructure fund that has been rolled out and is being rolled out, just to support infrastructure that supports housing. So yes, for the goal. Yes, for the getting the outcome that developers still make contribution that looked like LDR or is LDR or some other factor or is LDR at some other point in the process. But I'm not going to support the report back in 180 days. I'd rather frankly work with you on that. And if the Councillor is available next week, I'd like to meet.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker. Okay. Councillor Orlikow, your opportunity to close on the amending motion.

Councillor Orlikow: I just want to make sure. Because I knew that would come up of, oh, Mr. Fraser is going to be all upset. This is not new money. I have all the quotes. He doesn't want new charges. This isn't a new charge. As I said, it's the same money. It's not coming from tax revenue. It's not coming from general revenue. It's coming from the change that's associated with the application fee. I think we talked a lot about it today, the issues we're having on our budget. But this won't affect our budget, it will help our budget, will be coming from developer potential profits. Mr. Fraser was quite clear. And again, I don't work for him. But we have Ottawa...Ottawa just recently passed a 50 thousand dollar upper on a development fee charge. Ottawa. Not the big feds, the City of Ottawa. Did they get punished? No, they did not get punished. Calgary is doing one. Everybody else is doing one. We're not, because we're so scared of the federal government. Well again, we can make it a part of that report to ask the minister. This is kind of our idea, what do you think? I'm fine with that too, I'm okay with that. We're not going to be impacting housing prices. This won't impact housing prices. It will impact some of the developers' profits. I'm sorry? Developer profits are important because they are business. We want to make sure they are successful. But we also want to make sure that we're getting that investment in our neighborhoods. So again, yeah, we can look at it another day, why would we look at it another day? I'm sorry. I don't want to look at it another day. Because as I said before, what I was told, if you're trying to tag a fee associated with rezoning changes, it has to be now not next year. Maybe we can because this corridor is pretty risky. The opportunity is here today. So again, I appreciate Councillor Rollins as the Chairperson has this other plan. I didn't know…maybe she could explain a little bit more what this all means. Again, those are huge bucket items, massive bucket items that are going in. I'm not even sure how the City is going to pay for this stuff. Or are all the developers going to pay for everything. I don't know. But again, this is simple. We already have a format in place, the LDR. It's already there. We just got to do a little bit of checksy wetsy, it's not had a hard. It's already there. So again, I'm not asking to break the bank. I'm not calling profiteer developers. They should make some profit, I agree with that. I'm just saying, now is the time, not later on to look at the LDR. Not to do that later. Now is the time to do it. And why wait? Because we're worried about Minister Fraser? He's already let Ottawa do it, and other cities do it. Well, are we different? Are we going to get punished? We've asked for 192 million dollars. We only ended up with 122. I am worried about the fact that we are not going to be able to reach our targets, and we're going to lose that last payment. That's what I'm concerned about right now. That's real money. Again, if we really focus on that. This won't take that much time. We have not...and I even said at one point, the Director said, we got a lot of that housing accelerator fund money, hire a consultant. It won't take long. We already held the format; the pamphlets are in place. So again, now is the time. Now is the opportunity. Not during or after the rezonings. Maybe the Mayor and BBC and other groups already know that don't matter. We're doing corridors, it doesn't matter if we're getting funding for the neighborhood or not. We're doing it regardless, so we don't care about this now, we can talk about it later. You know what? I do care. My neighborhood is going to care, your neighbourhood is going to care...when you tell them that we're doing a corridor and they are actually going to put nothing into the kitty to invest that, not into a sidewalk on the street, not into fixing up the boulevard trees, not into putting park benches nearby. Again, they are actually going to profit themselves and get to actually build a really big building. And you also, by the way, have no say. That's a lot to swallow, and yet, you're trying to sell something like this. So again, I am not telling…and again, maybe I should have just wrote down the exact policy and every detail, so they don't go freaking out on this impact fee thing. And that's what I did. I heard people, I listened to people, and I amended my general output on the information I got. Again, that's why I brought it up to Councillor Browaty. I'm amazed that I had to do this digging around. Why? The department hadn't even thought about it. They were talking about they don't want to be bogged down. They hadn't even thought about the impact of the cost or the LDR. After I was talking to the department, the land planning group about the different things in there. Oh, yeah, I see you're right. What do you mean? I asked them for the information. We don't have that yet. It's quite complicated, that's the information I got. Oh well, it is a little bit complicated. I'm not looking to the dollar, to the penny. I'm looking for a general overview. We got this type of housing changes, zoning changes, what is the impact from today to tomorrow. What did they change? If I could do it, it's not that complicated. You know, I am not a…these are some very, very bright people who work with us and that's their

job. So again, I will probably forward to get more of this going down the line, that they report back. Maybe we don't want to make them actually to do that kind of work either. We just want them to just focus on getting developers, so they can build quicker. That's the only thing we want. That's fair. Not accurate, because we aren't living in a developer world. We're living in neighborhoods. Neighborhoods are housed with people. So, we have to figure out a way to tell the people, yes, infill is very important. But you know what? You also will be getting some benefit directly to it so we can put more trees in your boulevard, do a garden, put some benches down, walkable communities, fix that sidewalk. We can do that kind of stuff. I don't know that answer yet, what can or can't be done. It depends on what comes back as a fee. So again, we can talk about this. Yeah, I really want to. It's good to work with you. I don't despair, the Mayor probably does. I haven't seen the date. We talked about it once. We had one staff member come down once. That was it. Because they wanted to talk about it at a later date. I don't. I think it's imperative because of the zoning changes. And what I've heard how it is bound, if you're going to do a zoning change fee kind of thing, they have to be done together, because then it gets a little messy later on. So, it's not…I'd like, you know, like development agreement parameters that we just discarded...parking. I want a report back. I'm not saying do this. I'm saying, I'm not the expert, I think we all should be involved in that. We should all have some discussion in that, so let's get a report back so that we can all see what the options are and we can vote on it collectively as a Council. You may still not agree with it then. That's fine. It won't take that much work. I believe this is the time to just get a report back. I believe this is the time to do it. But again, I am not that kind of guy that (inaudible) to think that you should all just accept my word because I'm John. I believe that you need to get professionals in the department to tell us the ABCs of this. That's all we're asking for today. I appreciate everybody has different priorities. But right now, for me, to be able to move forward with these housing accelerator funds and infill projects, this would be a great selling feature to neighbourhoods. So, when you are facing that neighborhood and go, why did you put that six-storey, 150-metre-long building on a corridor? Well, because it provides housing. It makes urban compact, all those things. You know, but also, you know what? We'll be able to plant some more trees here. We'll be able to do this. That is a much bigger sell, It's tangible. It's tangible for the neighborhood. So please just…it's a long day. I've been working on this for two and a half months. So, give me the credit to at least punch it down to a report.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And there's a few things I would like to respond to. Number one, you know, seeking an explanation, and I am happy to do that. It can be neatly summarized this way, Madam Speaker. Survive until 2025. That was the mantra many in the community were saying after the economic downturn that we faced right across Canada and around the globe of 2023-2024. We entered a term in Council that was fairly dire, Madam Speaker, post-COVID expressions of economic downturn that were very difficult. And so, my focus and my policy advice for this Council I think has remained consistent. But perhaps I have not explained that I took that survive until 2025 at heart. And I took it to heart because I knew folks, whether it was developers or within the building community, or just folks that were just trying to survive, Madam Speaker, until 2025, and we're not there yet. So, what the focus has been for me, is to make sure that I know first and foremost, that Property and Development is yes about, housing, and last term, I really underlined that point again and again and again on Executive Policy Committee, that we do create housing in this city. Whether or not we're enabling it, or we actually are working the way…the way that Winnipeg housing rehab, for instance, does. But we can create conditions that create units, and we do so every time by design and more. And so, Property and Development for me is an economic development enabler. And it's also a social enabler, as a result. But, surviving until 2025, whether you were an investor in this country, in this city, or you're a developer that was pretty critical for me and it's pretty…it remains critical. Surviving until 2025 when the election is in 2026 is a pretty big marker. So first and foremost, that's the focus. We're halfway done, folks, as of the end of this meeting today in terms of we have two years left in office, right? So, what are we going to do when we get here? So, the 2023-2024 economic downturn, absolutely a focus on the economic portfolio that is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. We still are growing as a city. We had an uptake in Winnipeg's population, and that's just a fact that Matt Driver just stuck in our email boxes not too long ago, and they need housing. And we have concerning vacancies where people want to enter the market. And so, scale. localization. Those are focuses for me, and then finally, inefficient strategic infrastructure. That's the focus for me this term. And I'm fighting to get to the infrastructure piece, right? We're fighting to get to that. So, in 2025-2026, we rebound, and we rebound, I think, by doing…by focusing, by focusing on the work and creating the jobs, and being really working shoulder to shoulder. And I want to say, if you know, I've said I think very clearly that impact fees are just not my priority or plan this term. But I want to comment that something else that Councillor Orlikow said, and Councillor Orlikow, he said, you know, I'm alone. And I want to say, Madam Speaker, he is never alone. I am often right beside him. Throughout our careers, Madam Speaker, I only beat him to an office at the centre for conflict resolution first once. After that, I followed him to school trusteeship, I followed him to Council. And indeed, I followed him to the Chair of Property and Development, Madam Speaker. So, he's never alone. I'm like a shadow most of the time. And his words are meaningful. And, you know, I have a vision for sure to set us up for success, to set an industry up for success. Many of them, in fact. But Land Dedication Reserve is fundamentally different from an impact fee. And so while…I did what we did in Standing Policy Committee and said no to 180-day report on the establishment of development fee or charge that complies with the ruling, and of course, it should. I would, similar to the Mayor, look at that Land Dedication Reserve that fundamentally was created before I was born, Madam Speaker. I mean, it was created in 1973. I was born in '74. So, it's 51 years old. And, to discuss

that in a thoughtful way. But to me, Madam Speaker, that was not before me as Chair, an impact fee was. So, I stand behind the vote at FPC and at EPC to shift the docus from an impact fee to the land dedication reserve and the policy that Council has. That is a meeting that I will endeavour to have with Councillor Orlikow, and any one member of Council that wants to discuss it. But I'd like to see a definitive vote here against impact fees, Madam Speaker, it was just not long ago...

Councillor Orlikow: Making the motion sound like it's on impact fees. I think it's quite clear it was not on impact fees.

Councillor Rollins: Item number ten has a resolution, Madam Speaker that says the Public Service should be directed to report back within 180 days with the options for the establishment of a development fee or charge. So, if I misspoke and I said impact fee and not a development fee. I can withdraw that, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Thank you.

Councillor Rollins: So that shift, to me, is a separate meeting, it's a separate item. It was one that wasn't before me or the Committee. But would invite a discussion, so that we can look at Land Dedication in a thoughtful way, look at the map in a thoughtful way, because when I entered Council, Madam Speaker, the math that was very concerning was the 37 million dollars that back in 2020 we had to make arrangements to hand back.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, we'll call the question on the amending motion five, moved by Councillor Orlikow. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Okay, the amending motion is lost. Okay. And I guess the main item, Mr. Clerk. All in favour of the main item? All in favour of the main item? Okay. Please rise.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, can you just clarify the main item is receive as info.

Madam Speaker: This is to support EPC's recommendation to receive the report as information.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

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

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Next is the report, did we do the July 11th? July 11th report, please.

Councillor Rollins: I move consent agenda item one with thanks to the committee.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Any questions? By-laws first.

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

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I move that the following By-laws be read a first time By-law number 62/2024, By-law 84/2024 and By-law 85/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

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

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker I move the following By-laws be read a second time. By-law 55/2024, By law 68/2024, By-law 70/2024, By-law 79/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws 55/2024, By law 68/2024. By-law 70/2024. By-law 79/2024.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the By-laws 55/2024, 68/2024, 70/2024 and 79/2024 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Rollins: I move that the following By-laws be read a first time By-law 82/2024, By-law 83/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law 82/2024, By-law 83/2024.

Councillor Rollins: I move that By-laws 82/2024 and 83/2024 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law 82/2024, By-law 83/2024.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
NOTICE OF MOTION

Madam Speaker: Question period under this committee. Any questions for the Chair? We do have a motion, actually. Let's go to motion eight. It's a notice of motion. It will appear on next month's Council agenda. It's moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Orlikow, and the topic Mr. Clerk is? Got it recently. The topic. Red tape commission?

Motion No. 8
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

WHEREAS the Red Tape Commission of 2004 to 2007 called for and changed Council By-Laws requiring that Community Committees could only lay over a Public Hearing item twice, at any Community Committee meeting, and thus for a maximum of three (3) months or ninety (90) days;

AND WHEREAS the purpose of the said change was to 'streamline' the process and make the subdivision/rezoning process more efficient and effective for City of Winnipeg, for residents and for applicants in the process;

AND WHEREAS advertising for said hearing matters were also improved, with large four (4) foot by eight (8) foot signage required on a site, for better notice of a coming Public Hearing, making said advertising more readable and easily accessible for local residents and local communities;

AND WHEREAS since that time, the Public Service has not been held to the same three (3) month standard in terms of Customer Service Processes, that presently exists at all the Community Committee Public Hearing stage in the process, and therefore, today, we unfortunately see applicants experience up to one (1) year delays, from the point they file their application with the Planning Department, to the point of when the item appears on the agenda at a Public Hearing;

AND WHEREAS the 'back end' to the process for an applicant, has increased as well, with delays now as long as eighteen (18) months, or more, for applicants to receive their Executed Development Agreement, directly affecting the ability to supply much needed housing, jeopardizing projects needlessly in a changing housing market subject to outside challenges, such as labour supply, changing interest rates and changing material supply costs, causing some projects to actually die due to the City's inefficient and outrageous red tape;

AND WHEREAS if the actual decision making body, that is responsible for the actual approval/disapproval, along with detailed amendments to applications, can do so within three (3) months, there is absolutely no reason that the public service can be held to the same standard, namely a three month timeline to process an application in order to appear on a public hearing agenda, and another three months following the public hearing, to process said approved applications, therefore creating a process that is no more than nine (9) months in length.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

1. *That Winnipeg City Council establish and direct the Department of Planning, Property and Development, a Subdivision, Rezoning, Variance, and Conditional Use Public Hearing Process, that requires, from the date that an application is deemed complete, ninety (90) days for the application to appear on a public hearing date, not including any prorogue periods set by Council;*

2. *That Winnipeg City Council establish and direct the Department of Planning, Property and Development, an Subdivision, Rezoning, Variance, and Conditional Use Public Hearing Process, that requires, from the date that an application approved, namely at a Council Meeting (or at delegated committee by Council) and first By-law reading, ninety (90) days for the application to be fully completed with an executed development agreement(s) delivered to the applicant, not including any prorogue periods set by Council;*

3. *That clear standards be set for filing an application, that does not require an applicant to make multiple copies of an application, and simplifies the system to ensure that it is open and transparent regarding the definition of a 'deemed complete application' by the City of Winnipeg Public Service, and;*

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

Madam Speaker It's regarding development.

Councillor Rollins: I'll take questions now.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Madam Speaker: Okay. Questions.

Councillor Rollins: Councillor Eadie has a question, I believe.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, a long day. But Madam Speaker, It was pointed out in just the recent debate that we had, it was in the City of Winnipeg Act, and now in the City of Winnipeg charter, that LDR is established,

where it talks about development. And if you don't provide enough, anyway, the provisions are in the charter. And just to point out like maybe you could just change instead of saying 10 percent in lieu of whatever, 10 percent of the added value on a rezoning, you could have the charter changed to say maybe the value of the bird building permit, or whatever, in lieu of not giving up LDR. Now the thing is, Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Chairperson realizes that in order to continue an LDR and have it applied in a different way, that it requires time to establish the background and proper provisions to submit to the province, to the province, Madam Speaker. To the province to get okeydokey to change the charter. So is the Chairperson aware that it is good, that process in itself can take like two years.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am aware. I came to Council, having worked for the Manitoba Government. I did a brief stint at the national inquiry before I came to Council. But I worked at Priorities Planning Committee in Cabinet. I worked with legislators. And so, I am aware. I'm also aware that our charter and planning act are opened right now in the legislature. As a matter of fact, I think there's hearings starting next week on elements that people can go and speak to with respect to stages in the legislative process. So absolutely aware, absolutely aware of the prep. I've done it myself on a number of acts, including the compliance regime for the Accessibility Act in Manitoba. I've done it myself for the immigration, looking at immigration law, including constitutional law. I was responsible for section 35 consultations, so for sure, I'm aware, and have been working with Property and Development who are looking at the Planning and Development Act in the charter, as part of their day-to-day work, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, it's very clear to me that the Chairperson understands the process down there, and what's opened is the metro Winnipeg finding. That's what they are having hearings on. Madam Speaker, I'm just…does the Chairperson think that we got to start moving because they are having hearings, not on changes to LDR, Madam Speaker. How are you getting that into the process? Should it not be started now. Yes or no?

Councillor Rollins: Back to what? Because, in fact, we started months and months ago, so with respect to what? With respect to Land Dedication? With respect to elements of the planning act? With respect to, you know, the City of Winnipeg's ambitions for legislation to change writ large? That, you know, we discussed in part with the Mayor because the Mayor is our Federal Provincial lead. I am involved, as Chair of Property and Development because the department is involved in data sharing on a number of fronts with the Provincial and the Federal Governments. So, I understand if the question is general, the time is now. If it's specific, I would ask for further clarification.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering why the Chairperson didn't say we're working on LDR. The planning act is over down the at province so there's no need for Councillor Orlikow's motion.

Councillor Rollins: Never said that Madam Speaker. Councillors bring forward motions, and that's their purview.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Chair? Seeing none. Councillor Eadie, will you move the Governance Committee report, please?

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED JULY 8, 2024

Councillor Eadie: Oh, yes, I move report. It's really an extension of time on the changes to the code. Members of Council code of ethical conduct. I'll move report...one. One and two.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Okay. Mayor Gillingham, you'll move adjournment.

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, I will, all the best everybody.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Stay for roll call for a moment.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 6:42 p.m.