COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, February 27, 2025

The Council met at 9: 41 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

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

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Chambers.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. It is my pleasure to now introduce today's pages. We have Himani Bhatt from Dakota Collegiate who resides in the St. Norbert-Seine River Ward and Renz-Danielle Gatiwan from St. John's High School who resides in the Mynarski Ward. Thank you for being here to serve with Council today. We will now move onto announcements, the mayor. We do have special guests that will be recognized in the gallery today and other announcements. Mr. Mayor, over to you.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you so much, Madam Speaker. And good morning to all. First of all, we want to begin by welcoming this year's first year creative communication students that are here today from Red River College Polytechnique along with their journalism instructor, Joanne Kelly. So, thank you so much for being here today. They will be writing stories on today's Council meeting, and I am sure that they will have questions for us later today. So, again, welcome to each one of you. Today, Madam Speaker, I want to (applause)…Yes, let's welcome them. In a much more serious note, Madam Speaker…Madam Speaker, I know that all of our thoughts are with the families and searchers upon yesterday's news that potential human remains were discovered at Prairie Green Landfill. We all await further information, and we will be closely following developments as they become known in the coming days and weeks ahead. This upcoming Friday, March the 7th, is International Women's Day. I know there will many ways to…yes, to celebrate this. I, first of all, want to thank all of the women councillors who are here on Council. And Councillor Santos who is not here today. But thank you so much for hosting the women in politics forum that I think was very successful. I saw the news on it. And I think it was an excellent way to encourage more women to be involved, engaged politically and to run for office. And on International Women's Day, Friday March 7th, I will be hosting a luncheon at the Fort Garry Hotel. Everyone has been invited and I hope to see you there. The week following is March 14th, the State of the City address. And again, everyone is invited to that event, also. Coming up this weekend, Winnipeg's large and growing Muslim community will be celebrating and acknowledging Ramadan. It starts Saturday, March the 1st, and I believe includes March 30th, with Eid. And there will be many opportunities for Winnipeggers to participate in iftars and just standing alongside our Muslim Winnipeggers. Last week, I had the chance on behalf of Big City Mayors Conference of Canada to, upon invitation, attend an event of the US Conference of Mayors in Phoenix, Arizona. That event was quite interesting, to say the least, to able to sit kind of in the room with mayors. It was a closed door session of about 50 mayors of the leadership team of the US Conference of Mayors. And to sit and to listen to all the US mayors are going through in their cities right now, mayors and councils of the United States largest cities, are facing, really, the impacts of the executive orders and decisions that the president is making and that is certainly having a significant effect on their communities. But it was a great opportunity to connect with US mayors. I can tell you, to a person, each mayor was very warm, receptive. If this is telling, one of the mayors came up to me, shook my hand and said, hi, I am the mayor of a city in California and we respect Canada's sovereignty and in no way think, you know, Canada should become the 51st state. And so, they understand our trade relationship. They understand the importance of our ally-ship. And thanks to FCM's work, we were able to provide to each mayor a detailed set of stats that outline the trade relationship between Canada and their respective state. And when I was up to do my presentation and talk about the fact that their priority…first of all, their priority as mayors, not surprisingly, is housing. Housing in their cities, that is the priority of US cities right now. Sounds familiar, does not it? And when I was able to say,

well, listen, a 25 percent tariff on softwood lumber will drive your housing costs up. 25 percent tariff on aluminum and steel will drive all your infrastructure projects up: your bridges, your community centres, the buses; many of which your transit buses are made in part in our city of Winnipeg. But if tariffs are applied…counter-tariffs applied, the cost of buses and transit equipment is going to go up. They understand that. They completely understand it. The whole goal was to try to get US mayors to leverage their relationship with state legislators and their federal connections, whether it is the congressmen and women or their senators to try to appeal, ultimately, to the White House to put a hold on or stop or cancel the tariffs. So, I did not feel in any way we had opposition. I felt, in fact, we have allies in the mayors and councils in the US. Both Democrat and Republican mayors alike understand the implications of this. So, I continue to ask us all to leverage every relationship we have on both sides of the border to make sure that we are doing all we can within our power to mitigate the impact of tariffs. I also want to thank our staff, on behalf of all of us, our City staff who put on a council seminar for us on the potential impacts of tariffs and what we can do as a council to mitigate it, to lobby for the reduction of interprovincial trade barriers, to find other sources for supply and procurement, as well. So, much more to come, but I want to thank everyone who has been involved thus far. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

MINUTES

Councillor Allard moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on January 29 and January 30, 2025, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We will now move into delegations. We have one delegation registered today. David Grant is appearing remotely on a number of items as outlined in our agenda. David Grant, over to you.

DELEGATIONS

David Grant: Thank you very much. And thank all of Council for allotting time for delegations. I hope you will not object to my spending less than a minute on some context. That I spend so much time following your agendas, is an indication of the importance that I associate with city government. What you do strongly affects the lives of me and my friends and my neighbours. I believe that sometimes I raise points that no one else does and that are very relevant to the important work that you do. On occasion, a few of you have acknowledged the value that you derive from points being raised. As I have explained this week the most, there is a very small weakness in your current resolution that concerns me. It did not exist during the healing…hearing and it would be easy to fix. It concerns me that the team of reporters at City Hall is silent on most of the items on your agendas. This concerns others, too. Reporters can be vexing, but without them asking tough questions, things can go very wrong. I want to greet all the journalism students in the room. You are the future of our democracy. I hope that each of you will learn to explore all the aspects of the issues in the news beyond the popular narrative. Thank you again. Moving on to topic EPC number one: Open Government. The repeated delays that waste your time and waste space on your agendas can be prevented. If a report is to include the careful analysis of data generated up to year end, then that report should not be promised until late Q1, like in weeks from now. Once a reasonable schedule has been set, then staff should work toward that goal. I was involved in secretary audit reporting for many decades in a variety of organizations, each similar in size to City Hall, and I do not recall a single time that routine periodic reports could not be submitted on time. I do not expect you to change the way that City Hall works, I just want to remind everyone that frequent delays are not the norm outside of City Hall. I also want to suggest that staff use customer demand to guide your moves toward open government. If 311 and FIPPA requests come in for a type of data set, then that one should be the next for the public facing webpage. Publishing data that nobody wants is not a lofty goal. Keeping data hidden that residents want to access is also not a good thing. But I am looking forward to that report when it comes. EPC three and four. As expressed to EPC, we are…we in the community find it very troubling that EPC's reaction to these two analogous funding requests. Both, obviously, do not conform with the rules, so both requests could have been turned down. My comments on each are on the record under EPC. Small ranks benefit the community, providing minimal funding for them would be nice and a mechanism should be made clear to the public. Here is how you do it, and here is the steps for reimbursement. EPC denied the funding of a local rink but handed 70 times as much money to the…to benefit the hiker, biker lobby for a walking trail. Both projects violated City Hall rules. Lobbying and making allies on Council are both techniques that get results. Some folks say that neither of these benefits the public good. On PD two…PPD two: The Pacific land giveaway. City Hall will give away a 500,000-dollar triple building lot for a dollar to a builder who they…is approved. While there seems to be no evidence of wrongdoing, this sale of land should have followed the more ethically certain and traditional route. When the land has been assembled, it should be invited all subject to published conditions

including how many low-cost units must be provided. Doing this right should take no longer and it provides a level playing field for all interested developers. On Water topic four, the City has been promised huge amounts of free energy. There is a catch. The agenda item raises important questions but fails to answer any of them. Where has this plan been tried previously? Topic one…or my subtopic one. How did it work there? Thousands of brilliant people have been working on energy saving ideas for decades. It is very unlikely that they all missed what you have been told is a new idea. Could be, but let's check that out. Topic two…subtopic two: What is the timeline of the FCM application? We were told that the Federation of Canadian Municipalities if going to be funding this idea. How much funding does FCM say that they will pay? Under subtopic three: Efficiency Manitoba has been…has more expertise in these matters. Have you approached them for comments on the merits of this proposal? Has the City yet approached EM for any advice on anything? City Hall has an in-house energy team. Has any in-house energy expert at City Hall been asked for comments on this scheme? If not, why not? If they have, why does it not appear on this agenda item? Just like your staff, city…Council's obligation is to taxpayers, not to a third-party consultant. Your fiduciary responsibility says to not approve until these questions are answered. Subtopic four: The electricity used to heat and cool a large building can never be zero. We all learned this in high school. Net zero is impossible. Anyone who tries to tell you otherwise should not be trusted. Advance technology can drastically reduce the amount of electricity consumed by a machine or a process, but never to zero. There are absolute laws like entropy and enthalpy. To ignore them is a bad thing. And I would invite any questions on these topics. Thank you.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the delegation, I find it interesting that the delegation is saying that the concept of carbon zero is impossible given the sun that is…that the earth revolves around and the nearly unlimited energy that we could capture from it. So, I just…I wonder about that statement in particular.

Madam Speaker: David, would you like to respond?

David Grant: Sure. Thank you. Specifically, I am referring to the users of electricity. Obviously, there are things that we can do. And Manitoba should be proud of the hydroelectricity that we produce at no real cost other than we have to build and maintain a dam and the machines. But the users of electricity is what I was getting at. People say we can do this mechanical work. We can provide this service to the people at no cost. And whether it is clearing snow from our roads or heating our homes, that does have a net cost in energy used. And that is what I was getting at is that you can not get energy from nothing. You can divert it. And when the sun has put water up here and it goes down there, we have hydroelectricity. We have wind power and we have solar cells that convert sunlight directly into electricity. And these are all good things, and they are net producers of energy. But the users of energy can never be zero. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, David. Thank you for the response. Second question, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Follow-up. So am I to understand the clarification then that there actually could be carbon zero, but the delegation was referring to the cost of transitioning to a carbon zero economy? I can accept that, but the idea that the concept is impossible defies reason.

Madam Speaker: No further…no further questions then. That was more of a statement.

David Grant: Yeah, I think, if I may be allowed 30 seconds, no, I am not saying that it is that. It is that the users…like, if we have an arena, which has compressors and lights and fans, and that arena will be a net consumer of energy. That is what I am saying. If it had enough solar cells, if you have an operation that has solar cells and runs on that, that is approximately net zero. So, if you have a traffic light, for example, or a flashing highway sign; that thing, with its solar cells is not consuming net power, but a hockey arena will be consuming power no matter what we do with it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Grant. One question by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. Thank you. And this is a really important issue. We have to keep an open mind. And that means we have to keep an open mind in all directions in terms of possibilities and feasibilities. And we have to deal in the practicality here, Madam Speaker. Because, Madam Speaker, it is one thing to say things like zero carbon emissions and it is one thing to actually attain it and prove it. And if we say these things and we can not prove it, that is dangerous, Madam Speaker, to economic development and to our…to our future. And on that basis, I have to admit that our delegate has said…Mr. Grant has said, he has made a good point that when it comes to, at this moment in our technology, when it comes to electronics, photonics; such as lights, yes, we can run that by solar power. He made the point, though, that especially at our latitude in the world, the 50th parallel, the amount of solar energy that we can get is limited to those that are closer to the equator. Fact of physics, Madam Speaker. And so, on this basis, we need to be practical and we need to be realistic. And I…and when…he made a point in terms of the difference between lighting, electronics or photonics,

and that when it comes to literally moving physical objects, like a fan. And on that basis, I would like to know if he could elaborate on this. It is really, really important. Because there is no point in being fooled one way or the other in terms of the practicality and reality of these things.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. David, the response.

David Grant: Sure. Thank you very much. The powering of large machines and, really, even the little fridge plant in an arena, is a large mechanical machine. And what is proposed is not to power it with a solar cell which, as was pointed out, they need scraping the snow off and all that kind of stuff. But it was not proposed that way. It was proposed that hydropower from our dams go into the arena, like it always has, and yet, somehow, this is going to be a net zero consumer of power. And that is the part that I am suggesting is impossible. And yes, in a place where there is no snow and where you can wash the dust off the solar cells, you can have an operation that is powered entirely by solar cells or wind. But it does not work as well at night, depending on batteries. So, there are other ways of dealing with it. I am just talking about the term net zero. Because we can reduce like crazy. We can make streetlights that take one tenth the power they used to, maybe one percent of the power. But they are still taking power. So, and that is something that…just the concept of net zero suggestions that it is not using power and it is. That was all. Thanks very much, Mr. Schreyer.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. And we happen to live in a province, one of the very few places in the world, Madam Speaker, where we actually export hydroelectricity. Eternal electric…could be eternal, Madam Speaker. We do not know how many centuries our hydro dams will be…will be creating carbonless energy. So, the question is, as Councillor Allard alluded to, the difference between net carbon, zero…zero…net zero carbon and net zero energy. Madam Speaker, we have got…our electricity grid in Manitoba is based on electricity, unlike in Alberta or most other places in North America, where you get your electricity from carbon fuels. Like natural gas and coal. Our electricity is from hydro. Would Mr. Grant like to elaborate on the distinction between the electricity we get in Manitoba versus the electricity in most other places in North America and the world, which is not from hydro, it is from…it is from fossil-fuels.

David Grant: Okay, the agenda item is really about the modification or the exploration of modification of a hockey arena. But for generational electricity, certainly, ours is one we can be proud of. There is a certain…if you want to do net carbon analysis in the…Making a dam, you have to burn a whole lot of rock to make that concrete. And you have to refine the copper. So, there is a lot of carbon expended into the atmosphere as we build a system. But once the system is up and running, until parts have to be replaced, it is pretty much net zero for the generation of power. But the users of power are something that we should be working toward minimizing, the power wasted. But we can never get to zero because you cannot have a big machine churning away without consuming some power. But thanks for bringing up the wonderfulness of Manitoba Hydro. I devoted my career there. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our questions. We will now move on to reports. Thank you, Mr. Grant. Have a good day. It is the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 18th, 2024. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED FEBRUARY 18, 2025

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise and introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 8. I think on Item 2 there is an amending motion.

Madam Speaker: There is. Thank you. Councillor Wyatt? 3: Municipal Canada Community Building Fund Agreement has been pulled. And 8 is the Subdivision and Rezoning on Granite Way. I will call the question on the others; Item 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 2 – Application to the Federal Canada Housing Infrastructure Fund (CHIF) for the City of Winnipeg NEWPCC Upgrades: Biosolids Facilities and the Southwest Interceptor Projects

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mayor Gillingham will introduce the main item, followed by Councillor Mayes who will introduce his amending motion that was seconded by Councillor Orlikow. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Yes, what we have before us here is the staff's recommendation on the applications that we would put forward for the Canada Housing Infrastructure Fund. It is a federal

fund, five billion dollars of which of that envelope is through a provincial territorial stream and then a billion dollars is a direct stream that municipalities can access directly. And so, for the direct stream, the application really closes on March the 31st of this year. So, we need to get our application in. Our staff has recommended that we apply for funding for southwest interceptor, which is a critical project that our staff has been working on. And then, for the provincial territorial stream, the application is related to our North End plant project. And we, as a city, have been working very closely with the Province of Manitoba and the Federal Government. I want to acknowledge both those senior levels of government for their hard work. Appreciate that our premier has said that the North End plant is his priority, as it is our priority as a council as well. We have to get that North End plant fully funded and fully built so that we can address the capacity issues in the City of Winnipeg and also meet our requirements under our provincial regulations to comply with the Save Lake Winnipeg Act. And third, we have got old infrastructure. That plant has been around since the 1930s and it is time to replace it. But ultimately, we really need that plant built and funded so that we can accommodate the growth of our city. More housing, more employment lands, and job creation. And we only have so much capacity left there. Only, I think, four to six years of capacity. So, this is and remains, I think for all of us, the priority project. But the southwest interceptor is also a critical project for growth. It must be done to accommodate what has been one of, if not the fastest growing area of our city in the southwest. So, I will be supporting the staff's recommendations. I will…I will not be supporting the amending motion that is here. My understanding is the movers…the movers of the motion, I do not know if they have consulted with our staff. I think our staff has done their best work in bringing forward recommendations as to what should be funded. I think it is incumbent on us as a Council to stay the course and understand that our staff have a clear line of view on what the priorities are as far as the several infrastructure projects that they are accommodating. We do know that the southwest interceptor checks all the boxes of the Canada Housing Infrastructure Fund, the CHIF fund, application requirements. There are requirements around be that CHIF fund. And any project to which we apply…for which we apply funding and request funding has to meet the eligibility criteria. And the southwest interceptor certainly does that. And so, I will be supporting the main item, not supporting the amending motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Mayes to speak to the main item and your amending Motion 1.

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

WHEREAS after completion of the work for the Armstrong District Plan, the next large Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) project will be the St. Boniface Mission District Plan;

AND WHEREAS it is an approximately $150 million project,

AND WHEREAS work could be completed by 2031 if additional funding is secured;

AND WHEREAS the city is 50 years behind the targeted completion date for CSO work at current funding levels;

AND WHEREAS the public service has indicated in in previous reports that the CSO program should be funded by the city along with the Province and Federal Government, but the city has not yet requested any finding from the other two levels of government;

AND WHEREAS additional sewer capacity in the Mission District Plan will enhance residential and commercial development opportunities within that district;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 2 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 18, 2025 be amended as follows:

- *In Recommendations 1, 2, and 3, delete the words "Southwest Interceptor" and replace with "Combined Sewer Works in the St. Boniface Mission District"*

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am in support of the application to receive the federal funding for the biosolids project at the North End plant. However, I do think we have already committed funding in our capital budget toward the southwest interceptor project. A project which I have fought for when certain members of Council who are no longer around the table did not want to fund that between the 2018 and 2022 period. Certainly, the current mayor as Finance Chair was supportive of funding the southwest interceptor. So, I have no desire to see that project scrapped. I think that is a good project. But the amendment speaks to another important area of public policy which is the combined sewer project. So, I will come to the amendment in a moment, but on the main motion, let's be clear, there is a federal CHIF fund. There was an announcement in the fall economic statement that Winnipeg would get 150 million dollars. Problem number one: The fall economic statement has no legal force and effect due to the prorogue of parliament. Problem

number two: We are applying under the provincial territorial stream. There is no provincial territorial eligibility criteria guidelines, there is no document because we do not know if this province has signed an agreement yet. The deadline was December 31st. We are sometimes faulted here for not asking questions, so I asked the Federal Government did they sign a deal by December 31st? It is a yes or no question. And the answer was, we are still talking. It is not a…so, apparently it was not a yes or no question. So, we are applying for something where we do not know the deadline to apply, we do not know the rules, but we have a promise of 150 million dollars starting…starting in 2026 running, actually, out beyond the life of the next federal government, unless it holds for five years, all the way to 2029-30. So, it would be nice to get that funding. It is all after the federal election, though, so. Somebody asked me: Why are you against the Mayor's efforts to secure funding? It is not secured. It is an application. It was promised in the fall economic statement that has no legal force and effect. Nevertheless, the Mayor is to be commended for trying to get funding to the biosolids project. So, I will be supporting that. Additionally, not only do we not know what the handbook, what the deal is, what the rules are for the provincial territorial stream, we do know that under the other stream you cannot...no work can start until you have satisfied the federal Indigenous consultation of permits and the federal environmental consults. We have already started work on the biosolids, that is undebatable. That is clear. Mr. Shanks has been very forthright saying, yes, we are underway with the work. We have had a contract. People are on-site. So, we may have to stop work on a project we are racing to complete. But the staff have indicated they are confident when I asked. And I want to thank…I believe Mr. Armbruster said, no, we are okay on the environmental and the Indigenous piece in so far as we know. We are not aware of any requirements we are not meeting. So, let us then apply for the 150 million dollars and we can hope we get it. It will be after the next federal election, best case. The amendment, though, seeks to address the other part of the application, the direct stream where we do have certain rules that have been laid out. See earlier comments about the Indigenous and the environmental aspects. But we do know there is a March 31st deadline there under this direct stream. So, I supported the southwest interceptor, I continue to support it. We should fund it. But we are, we are taking steps to fund it already. What we are not funding adequately is what this amendment addresses. It is an important environmental concern, that is our work on the combined sewer system of Winnipeg. So, crash course for the people up in the gallery; combined sewer system route, it covers the pre-1960 part of Winnipeg. It is a system where the sewage and excess land drainage, heavy rainfall, go into the same pipe. Inevitably, then you have events where there is too much, the pipe can not handle it. Two options: into your basement or out into the river. We opt for the out into the river. Since 2019, we have been under a provincial requirement to be done with all sorts of work to reduce those sewer spills. Over a billion dollars worth of work by 2045. If you look at the document that is in DMIS from 2023, it says, if we do not get federal and provincial help, we will be done in 2095 if we keep funding at 30 million dollars a year in 2019 dollars. We did have brief moment of glory there where we went from 30 million to 45 million for four years. Kudos to the Mayor as Finance Chair when we did that. But we are now reverting…if you look at our budget, we are reducing money to address sewage spills by a third. We are going from 45 million to 30 million. This is a problem. The deadline not only is 2090, we may now be out beyond the century mark. Perhaps…I have said in the past, it is a good thing Councillor Allard has the young son, he can be there when we finish this program in 2090. I do not know. I do not know if we will make it by then because we aren't even keeping up with the 30 million in 2019 dollars. We need to do something to accelerate the work. I have said in the past, I refuse to leave here with a 2090 deadline I am passing on to my children and grandchildren. It appears I will be leaving here at some point with that deadline the way we are going, but at least I can say I tried. So, what we should do then is this. We have reports that say this is supposed to be three-way funding split, the combined sewer work: federal, provincial, city. Well, we do not get federal and provincial, have we ever asked for it? No, we have not. Former Mayor Bowman used to say, go do your number on the CSOs, but the number one priority is the North End. Do not get in the way of that. Fair point. I have said in the past, probably the best sewage mayor we have ever had, Mayor Bowman. But the point was, here we are going for the North End. We are actually not displacing that funding. That is priority number one. Okay. So, what can we do then? Why are we falling off to the southwest interceptor when we have this other program. We have a legal obligation to be done by 2045. We are cruising in for 2095 right now to land this thing. Not really very good environmental practice. So, here is an opportunity. We can keep writing reports bitching about federal and provincial governments not providing joint funding, even though we have never asked them to provide that funding. Or we can actually do something. We can actually ask the Federal Government for some funding. So, what does the amendment say? It does not alter the timeframe. We know we have got that CSO work, a bunch of different districts. The staff, to their credit, have said it is not political, we are going bang for the buck. We are doing Armstrong, then we are going to go do Mission because that is…we have put the money in there, that is the biggest reduction we get in sewage bills, okay. So, what is next? Mission in Councillor Allard's ward. Let's go accelerate the work in the Mission district. Let's go do that or let's concede that we will be done when our children's, children's, children can celebrate the end of this program. But we have a chance to ask for federal money. We keep complaining we are not getting federal and provincial funding, but we never actually ask for it. Here is our chance. We are not leap-frogging over the northwest…over the North End sewage treatment plant. And I have…as I say, I am fine with funding the southwest interceptor, it is in the budget. What is not in the budget is any sort of commitment to keep going on the CSO plan in any sort of way that will get us done by anywhere near the 2045 deadline. So, the amending motion is an attempt to get some recognition that we are at the current pace decades behind on the CSO work. We fault the federal and provincial governments for this because they are not joining us in funding. We also never asked them for funding. Something has got to give thing. If we ask and they do not fund it, then I guess we can say, well, we will be 50 years late in completing this. But this ridiculous artifice of it is all their fault, but we never actually asked

them for money. Like, let's be forthright about this and we will probably return to this in the very near future when we are debating water and sewer rates because that is what is paying for this. We have not taken on any debt to do the CSO work, it has all been pay-as-you-go. It has all been money from the water and sewer rates. So, there is no debt implication here. There is no jumping the queue. Oh, let's do the one in St. Vital, let's move that. No. The next one up is in Allard's ward, it is the Mission District. Tons of opportunity for green infrastructure there along the Seine River. It is a good…it is the work we should be doing. We are supposed to be doing 10 percent of this budget as green infrastructure. We are nowhere near that, but that is…Save our Seine is on the case. They want to some green infrastructure there. So, in short, I am prepared to support the overall motion. I think we should know what is in the provincial territorial deal. We do not. But it is important to get money for the biosolids. But it is also important to pay attention to CSO work where it is an environmental problem. We have actually reduced our…the money we are putting toward sewage bills from 45 to 30 million. We can leave it for the people in the gallery to sort this out when they are senior citizens or we can actually try and take some action now and get going and accelerate this program and try and meet the 2045 deadline. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker…

Madam Speaker: …Please rise.

Councillor Rollins: Oh, sorry. Thank you. Madam Speaker, I do support the application for funding under the Canada Housing Infrastructure Fund, but I rise because I am hoping that the…that Mr. Mayor will include in his closing remarks a bit of the follow…a bit of information. I do have, and it is no surprise here where I am going, I do have some significant concerns regarding the lack of transparency and governance surrounding the discussion of, not only this, but in particular the funding and the rates. And I understand and is probably in good order, Madam Speaker, that I am speaking before the new chair, Councillor Eadie. And of course, I have asked, through you, Madam Speaker, for the Mayor to address this specifically. It is essential for the public to have a clear line of sight into financial commitments and the projected impacts of the proposed changes, particularly in light of what we know to be proposed sewer rate increases and the delay of critical reports. And I will point out in this report, the last pages really state twice something that I believe the administration intended to be taken together with the rate report that we do not have. The application for funding, if successful, does promise to…a reduction in the City's share of the project costs. However, the report fails to provide sufficient clarity on key aspects such as the impact of the proposed sewer rate increase, which has been delayed again, Madam Speaker. The absence of a comprehensive discussion on how these rate increases will be managed and how they will impact residents is literally implied two times in this report, Madam Speaker. It is there. It is written. The author, likely, Madam Speaker…And I can not speak for the Public Service. I would welcome them to weigh-in, as I have, over e-mails. They…the writer assumes that we know what the increased rates are. So, the absence of a comprehensive discussion on how these rate increases are implied in the report, how they are going to be managed is implied. And this is the pathway forward in the report. Apply for this, and they will be reduced. This, to me, is a major governance issue. It is a sequencing. It is a sequencing that the Mayor's Office controls, Madam Speaker. It looks like the public servants intended to see this material in context, Madam Speaker. So, with such a significant funding application on the table, the public, Madam Speaker, deserves to know more about how these decisions will affect their pocketbooks in the short and long-term. Moreover, the freeze on development charges proposed in the report extends beyond the current council's term. That might raise concerns for future governance. While I understand the need to ensure that funding agreements are honoured, committing future councils to a freeze might be seen by some as a matter of transparency and a debate that should take place in context. The report highlights the importance of the southwest interceptor project. And it also highlights the alleviation of pressure on the sewage system for southwest Winnipeg. There is no doubt this is a strategic project of the highest caliber of the generational projects…among generational projects in Canada, in fact. It is such a large-scale project we have many reports. The public and future councils must be given the proper tools to make informed decisions rather than having to rely on incomplete delayed information. It is Schrodinger's cat at its best, Madam Speaker. In conclusion, while I support the funding application, I recognize the need that these important infrastructure improvements. I really urge Council to prioritize transparency and good governance. And I am hoping the Mayor will speak to that specifically given the manner in which the Public Service wrote this report. Implied that the reader likely knew what the rates were that would be reduced if we make this move. Arguably, not having the rates and the perhaps shocking amount that they are, this report would have been seen in context. I agree with the Mayor with respect to, you know, time is of the essence. And we have done the southwest interceptor. But I do not agree that all of Council has been even provided the time to enter in which should it be other than the votes on Council, which do matter, and we did vote on the southwest interceptor. I do want the public fully informed. I do want other governments fully informed. The…we only have complexity to add, Madam Speaker. We only have complexity to add on the financial commitments, the staggering bills that we have got. And future decision-makers, Madam Speaker, should not be boxed in by agreements. And I think, you know, Councillor Mayes and Councillor Orlikow might be up on their feet talking about that. But the line of sight, Madam Speaker, the lack of transparency and the unacceptable hold of the fact that the sewer rates should have been here in February. As you know, I argued they should have been there in budget. It is not just an update when you do something very different that you originally proposed

in the multi-year. It is a six percent tax increase. People deserve the line of sight. They deserved it this month. And I am hoping both the Chair and the Mayor who have…the Chair, thank you, Madam Speaker, has had really good public statements this week that they are developing a plan. Can they shed light on it before we vote on this? It is an important vote, Madam Speaker. We have the ability to be nimble and respond to changing circumstances. This vote is about that. It is about a fund we critically need, but it should also be about the transparency and the context and the complexity that we need to bring all Winnipeggers in on, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise…I will…Just to start off, I will be supporting our original recommendation to move ahead on these two projects to the two different streams, Madam Speaker. I am going to really just speak to the amendment. I just want to say, I mean, the Mission CSO area, Madam Speaker, is one of those areas which if we can get rid of the CSO overflow we are also adding the capacity for more industrial growth in the Mission industrial area. And it does provide green options for dealing with water, land water, that ends up into our combined sewers. But in discussion, I actually did not…do not think I got an electronic version of the amendment, but I believe it talks about, Madam Speaker, reprioritizing and putting Mission ahead of Armstrong, which covers our area, Madam Speaker. And the…well, I never read it. It is…

Councillor Mayes: …Fair enough. But, well you are…it does not. The Armstrong work is underway in Councillors Sharma and Eadie's ward. This is no way reprioritizes this...

Madam Speaker: …Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Okay. Anyway, there…I think there is wording…Anyway, Armstrong is still our priority for CSO. There has been a lot of planning and work going into it. And work is, I think, starting this year as they move ahead and spend the money they have collected from water bill payers, Madam Speaker. Either way, on the southwest inter…sewer interceptor, it will…it is something that the water bill payers pay for. The developers, though, they are the ones who put in the new sewers to the new homes that are built out there in Waverley West and southwest Winnipeg, Madam Speaker. That is why…but first thing is, I want to say, in consultation, Mission, in order to move that forward instead of the southwest interceptor, it will in no way meet the timeline for the application for that direct…direct line of funding, Madam Speaker. Whereas the interceptor, there is a…quite a fair amount of work that has gone ahead. And it is…it…everything that we have supplied for that application will meet criterias set out by the Federal Government under that program. The Federal Government will evaluate whether or not certain criteria or certain activities need to take place. But so, I am just going to quickly summarize. CSO is very important and it does allow for the capacity for more infill. We have other CSO areas where, you know, you are told you can not build that many units because the sewer won't handle it. So, they have to downsize the infill projects. So, that is how important it is. However, again, for CHIF, Madam Speaker, they are going to get a lot more housing if they fund…help us fund the southwest interceptor, which is what their goal is. That is the Federal Government and, well, Provincial Government, too, they want to see housing growth because our population is growing and we need housing. And we need housing, of course, that is affordable. But nevertheless, Mission is not ready to be applied for, Madam Speaker, and meet the timelines under this program. So, I will leave it at that. I won't be voting for the amendment. Although, I really do appreciate the meaning of it and its intention. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Madam Speaker, we should all be very, very concerned at the Federal Government bullying us. Bullying us in order to take money that we are needing for the new (inaudible) project in order to control how we decide to develop our city. And we are looking to what is going on in the south and we are questioning. This is a bullying tactic, Madam Speaker. They are suing that we are Toronto and we are in Edmonton…that we are in Edmonton, Madam Speaker. They are making assumptions without understanding the dynamics of what is going on in our own city in terms of housing. And what we are needing and where the type of development is needed, Madam Speaker. So, I am beyond frustrated that we are here having to make this decision today because I know we need this project to happen, Madam Speaker. I am very concerned that we are making this decision right now when we are about to go on to a big debate in terms of our four-plexes. And that we are having to be forced to make a decision on this funding here today. I am concerned because it lacks the complete understanding of what is going on within our inner-city communities that have boarded up and vacant buildings and that are really needing housing developed there. And their plan is to develop it elsewhere, Madam Speaker. I am really concerned that we are giving up the control of how we develop our city. How we want those developments to look like and how fast we want our city to grow. And we should be concerned about it because I really, quite frankly, think that is a big part of our job, Madam Speaker. So, we are basically, our hands are tied in order to get this funding that is critically needed. Now, that is not…that is…that is not all our fault, but I want to talk about the comments raised by Councillor…Councillor Rollins here today. She is not wrong. We have got some concerns that we have got to worry about with those rates, and the challenge is us making this decision here today impacts how those rates are going to be defined.

I also want to raise that…that Councillor…Councillor Mayes' motion regarding the combined sewer is really critical. So, maybe if the Mayor can kind of find out while the debate is happening on. Part of the problem being on Water and Waste over the years, we have seen how the developments really rely on us getting the defined sewer overflows because they can not handle the developments. So, by allowing the developments to happen in the future without doing the combined sewer overflows, we are providing the capacity within our new pick system, but are we…is it going to help the development capacity that we are going to be creating by allowing the Federal Government to do this to us if we get the development that we are hoping to occur. Will it be able to deal with the combined sewer overflows? The combined sewers. So, I am hoping he can maybe get that answer to us before kind of making a final decision here. But we should all be concerned because we are losing control of how we are developing our city. And we are basically…our hands are being tied behind our backs in order to get funding that is desperately needed for the city. And so, I want to raise this because we are seeing bullying happening. We are seeing bullying happening in the States towards Canada, and I want to raise that this is not healthy for Winnipeg. Us losing our ability to control how we develop our city is not a positive step. We are seeing the housing developments that we want. We are getting that missing middle. We have surpassed some of those numbers. We do need critical low-income housing, Madam Speaker. That is what we are missing. And we are also missing the fact that we need the development to happen in certain areas of the city that we are not seeing development. And by allowing us to continue moving on with the steps of the Federal Government is trying to make us agree to, in the future, what we are giving a carte blanche to where the developers can develop instead of controlling where we want them to develop. And encouraging them to develop in areas that critically need the development, Madam Speaker. So, I wanted to rise because I am frustrated with the Federal Government right now. And I feel that we really need to do a lot of work talking with the Federal Government, Madam Speaker, through you to the Mayor, on really understanding the dynamics of a prairie city. We are not Toronto. We are not Edmonton. We have different development needs here and we are missing the mark, Madam Speaker. And all you have to do is look at the development that we are seeing now and understand where we are at in terms of meeting our quotas. And look at the areas where, really, we do need development. So, I will leave it at that. I made my comments. But I wanted to raise my frustration because I think it is important for people to really understand that in order to get this money, we are signing off our rights, Madam Speaker. And that is a problem for me.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. I am rising to support the report, and I won't be supporting the motion that has been brought forward. I appreciate and respect the knowledge that Councillor Mayes has gained in the Water and Waste Department over time, but I am going to support what the department is bringing forward for the recommendation in this report. The southwest interceptor is fully funded right now. It is fully funded. What this report is asking to do is to use a different funding source because it qualifies for that funding source. And by using, and if it is accepted under the direct stream, it will lower the city…will lower the required City funding to 52.07 million. And proposed sewer rate increases could be reduced. That is on page nine. So, another thing I wanted to bring up, and I am going to send everyone this update that I had the economic department come up with. I wanted to know where the multi-family units were being developed. Where are these multi-family units being developed in this city over a period of time? And because we all think in wards, we all think in wards, I had the department break it down to wards. So, I will tell you, over the last…since 2018 to now, there have been twice as many in every ward, twice as many units, multi-family units developed in the Waverley West Ward. Why is that, Madam Speaker? Because it is easy. It is greenfield. It is easy. It is very, very, very difficult to develop multi-family in established neighbourhoods. Of all the things that I have experienced here at City Hall, one of the most difficult and challenging times is sitting through appeals. We have all sat through countless appeals where people do not want lot splits, they do not want infill, they do not want it. Sometimes, and I…you know, I had to laugh with Councillor Gilroy being so frustrated with the current government, and here I am saying, yes, current government, I really actually like that you are doing this. I like you are saying to cities, look, if you want to have more funding for your water treatment plants, start doing infill. Start using existing infrastructure that is already built. It is the hardest thing to do is to do infill from the model that we have set up where citizens are to represent…where councillors are to represent citizens and come forward. We are here to make hard decisions, big picture city decisions. Infill is probably one of the hardest things every single councillor has to do in this area. I will send you the updates of the multi-family. You will see; two to one, Waverley West, greenfield, fill it up. Easy to do. Infill is hard to do. I am supportive of this report that is in front of us. I am supportive of the department's recommendations on how to move some fully funded projects around so that we can access more funding and cost the City less. So, I won't be supporting this motion. I will send you this information about, you know, if you want…I call it contiguous development, you can call it urban sprawl, you can call it whatever you want. The fact of the matter is, infill is very difficult to do. And I also believe, I really believe, that if we do not show support for this 150 million by adhering to what the Federal Government is asking us to do, this is the test. If we do not support this, will we get more funding? Probably not. They are saying, here is 150 million. Do you…you know, you have got to…you have got to comply to these requirements. If we do not, do I think that we will get more funding? Absolutely not. I have a very good relationship with my MP that I work with. And I know that there is a lot of conversations going on right now looking for more funding for the sewer treatment plant. And…but if we are going to turn down 150 million dollars, I give up. Like, that is crazy. So, I am supporting this report and the department's recommendations.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak to this clause. I will not…I will be supporting the amendment, but I will not support the clause. This entire…if you read the report carefully, Madam Speaker, this entire project is now at 2.4 billion dollars. 2.4 billion dollars. The North End water pollution control centre. Combined with the other two treatment centres, we are actually at just over 2.8 billion dollars. The nutrient…the biosolids alone went from 2003 over 400 million to just over a billion dollars in two years. This is an out-of-control project, Madam Speaker, in terms of the capital cost this is going to have on the ratepayers of Winnipeg. Furthermore, how can anybody on this Council vote for a report when the federal minister, who is Terry Duguid, who was the same federal minister, Madam Speaker, who was the same individual, there is no other Terry Duguid I know of. He is born and raised in Transcona. Don Duguid is actually more famous than him because he was a famous curler. But anyway, Chairperson Terry Duguid. Better treatment taking action to improve water quality. Report of…on public hearing, City of Winnipeg wastewater collection and treatment system August 2003, Manitoba Clean Environment Commission. Appointed by no less than Gary Doer. The Province accepted this report, by the way. And I am going to read you one of the report's findings. Financial support, page 16, item 15, "The City of Winnipeg should be directly assisted by the Province of Manitoba in efforts to secure financial support under existing and future infrastructure programs for upgrades to its wastewater collection and treatment systems." Specifically, the funding formula, Madam Speaker, in the report, the funding formula of one-third municipal, one-third provincial and one-third federal should be used. Well, here we have the federal minister, and if my numbers are correct, Madam Speaker, and I think they are, I have added up the total federal funding for all these (inaudible) projects that either is pending or committed. And we are at 30…322…just over that, 322 million dollars. The provincial funding, pending or committed, is just over 278 million dollars. Combined, that is 601 million dollars. Keep in mind, right, I am going to use…I am not even going to use the 2.8 billion dollar number, which is all the treatment plants. I am going to use the 2.4 billion. That means that each level of government, based on my math, to be at the table for 800 million dollars. So, what does that mean now, Madam Speaker, to the ratepayers of Winnipeg? It basically means, Madam Speaker, is that the ratepayers of Winnipeg are going to take up the extra cost. That the Federal Government and the provincial governments are not committing to. Terry Duguid, as the Chair of the Clean Environment Commission, recommended one-third funding. Why are we as a city accepting a report with anything less? I can not support this, Madam Speaker. This is going to be a direct cost on the ratepayers of Winnipeg. We are adding 1.2 billion because of the Federal Government and Provincial Government not picking up their one-third envelope as was recommended in a report by the commissioner who was appointed by the premier of the day and the same premier, by the way, who this premier admires and gets advice from on a daily basis. Why are we allowing for anything less? Now, if you recall, this report was generated because there was, I think it was a bolt that broke in the North End treatment plant and millions or billions of liters of raw sewage spilled out into the river. And it was front page news at the time for days, maybe even weeks. And the Province reacted by appointing mister…had Mr. Duguid in place already, go and investigate, give us recommendations. He did that. Now Terry Duguid is our federal minister. What a great opportunity to renegotiate with him. We are on the eve of a federal election. Why are we accepting anything less, Madam Speaker? This has to be sent back, this report. I would encourage somebody to stand up here and do so. And anybody on Council who votes for this and who has been on the…you know, keeping costs low to the ratepayers of Winnipeg, as I know the Mayor has. It needs to be consistent. This is going to be a direct hit to the rates of water and rates of our city. The residents of Winnipeg are going to see costs with their water and sewer rates rise astronomically. That I would predict to you in the next 10 years or more will rival the cost of their property tax bill. Maybe beyond, based on these costs. Because I do not think 2.4 billion or the combined 2.8 billion for the existing program is going to end. And by the way, why are we building a biosolid plant? Last time I checked, only exists in Washington, DC. We are building it for our engineers to win awards maybe. I do not know. But why are we building the highest level of biosolid removal? You know, I recall the day when I arrived here a long time ago, Madam Speaker, when we actually put the biosolids on farm fields in the RM of McDonald. They actually loved it. But then they said, well, you can not do that anymore. The farmers loved it because the crops grew like crazy. But okay, I get it. We can not do that anymore. But then why are we building the highest biosolid required plant, you know, that exists in Washington, DC? To me that makes no sense. Yes, we have to build something, but could we bring our costs down there? We value engineer on our rec facilities all the time. We value engineer, which is code word for cutting, the scope of a project. Why are we just simply…well, because we can pass it on to water and rate increase to the poor people of Winnipeg. Madam Speaker, we can not go forward with this. And as far as I am concerned, the lengthy HAF, which is one-time money, okay, to this plant and the money that makes no sense to Councillor Mayes' point. You know, it makes no sense. We are getting…the kind of money we are getting in terms of the HAF from this program does not make any sense to me, Madam Speaker, with regards to a program that may not even be here in the coming months. And so, I am very concerned about that, that we would be propose…proposing to change zoning, which is a permanent change unless you change it back, for one-time federal money. And when we look at the envelope of federal money we are receiving, it, too, falls far short because for a federal government that also voted overwhelmingly, Madam Speaker, to make housing a right in their national housing strategy. And if housing is now a right like healthcare is a right, the Federal Government has to step up. And as we know, they receive the majority of the share of the tax dollars in this country. Frankly, Madam Speaker, we have not seen that from this Federal Government, or previous ones with regards to housing. And I do not think we are probably going to see it from the next one either based on what we are seeing in the public opinion polls. But…and what Mr. Poilievre has been

saying. But the reality is, Madam Speaker, we should not be changing our zoning by-laws so quickly to accommodate one-time, relatively speaking, not a lot of money when you actually look at the cost of building new housing. And there is another item on the agenda, Item 8, where we talked about on Granite Way. And the total cost of that project was…was extremely high.

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

Councillor Wyatt: 44 million dollars. 440,000 dollars a unit. I mean, you can see where our just over 100 million dollars one-time money from the Federal Government (inaudible) it is not a lot. And so, Madam Speaker, I really think that we have to push the Federal Government, with the help of the Province who had a signed off report and unfortunately, like anything else around here, it seems like it is out the door. Well, I was not here when that report came out. It is like the history and the knowledge of the past, out the door, out the window, we do not have anything to do with it. Well, I am sorry, this is a report from the Clean Environment Commission that was accepted by the provincial government of the day, an NDP government. We have an NDP government back in office. It is time to say to them, step up. We are doing these massive upgrades, as referred to in the report, and this is going to cost us a fortune. Unless, Mr. Premier, you want to see Water and Waste rates and it is about affordability, which he campaigned on, last time I checked, in the last provincial general election. This alone will drive people out of their homes, never mind their apartments, to have to pay the Water and Waste rates that are going to be coming down the pipe. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. I want to be very clear what I am voting today, that I am not voting for everything that I have been told to vote for going forward in the proposed changes to the infill housing, if you can call it infill housing anymore. Regardless of that, I will vote today to take one step. One step. But as we learned with the Housing Accelerator Fund, many councillors took that one step. Some people said, okay, after that, now I have seen the details. And that step was too far. We have the opportunity to say no later on. So, I am also not voting for four-storey four-plexes at this point. This is not a part of this discussion. This is…I am still…I wish I had more clarity. I, first of all, want to thank our CAO and our Director of Planning. We may not agree a lot what they are saying, but I do respect the fact they have given me information to help me try to get there. But I do not have all of the information. So, for example, I still do not know, in the report it says four-plex. Okay, that is something to talk about. But then, I get confused very quickly when I see reports that say, no, it is actually four-storey four-plex. Okay, now I am confused again. Well, it is not really four-storey, it is only 10 meters more in some spots. Okay, now I am really confused. It is some back lanes, some corner lots. So, it gets even more and more confusing. We only have had a few days. I was perplexed after the first Housing Accelerator Fund. I said, how do we not have some idea of what we are suggesting when we are voting on this? We should have some idea. Again, and I thank Hazel, the Director of Planning to…they quickly put it together so we could have that information prior to this vote today. I did not like the information, I can tell you that straight off the hop. There is some amendments I will require, I hope. But again, they provided that opportunity. I also got very upset because as we found out for the first…and then Housing Accelerator Fund, there was lots of information in there that we never supported or gave any council direction as of right housing. Well, now it is here. In the report I see the administration went out in the Housing Accelerator Fund report and said, oh, we are not going to support as of right housing. That is a policy decision by council. I was blown away when I read that line. That is something I do not support. I have not supported. I believe we can make it a better process. But it is as of right housing where you take the red tape, i.e. the people's voice away, is disgusting for me personally. There is many opportunities and you do not have to do a public hearing, but there is many ways to gather the public's input and still have a chance to have going forward. Again, these are my concerns that I had when I read it. And that is why I asked, can I see the report? Before I vote on it, I would like to see the actual…the report. And the answer I got from the administration back is, there is no report because there has been submission yet. I go, okay, that is crazy, but okay. We got…the Federal Government said, if you apply, we will probably give you 150 million. Okay, that is nice. But again, we are voting on a thing today that we actually do not know all the details. So, that is very concerning as well. What other things do they slide in there that I do not know about? Again, transparency and our duty to be informed and making decisions requires that we should have at least an opportunity to see the report. And if it is only just entering it into…well, we do not have a report. It is a matrix they put in. You just enter the data. I go, that is fine. Give me the questions that they asked for and then our answer. That is a report for me. That is fine. I would like to know what that is. So, again, I do not know a lot of things going on right now in this one. I do know the 150 million dollars, regardless, or that Councillor…I am with Councillor Wyatt on this one. Overall, the grand scheme of…and I really think it was generous by saying it is going to be a two-plus-billion-dollar project. I am more in the three-billion-plus project at this point. We have not really started yet. But again, I hope not. But again, the City is broke. And that is probably the reason why I went with Mayes…Councillor Mayes' motion here, and supported it, is we have this weird sense of both trickle-down economics. Well, we do not have to have developers pay anything. Do not worry about it. The less they pay, the more taxes will be generated and everybody will be happy. Well, we have gone…I am echoing Councillor Gerbasi in my head right now. So, let's do the southwest transit. Let's do that…let's do that pipe so we can get those precincts done in the south…the southwest quadrant of the city. Well, that is…those are all green fields. And as councillor…and the only one speaking up is Councillor Lukes who is

absolutely correct, developers like green fields. They do not have to pay for community centres. They do not have to pay for firehalls. It is an easy build. They can buy big lots. It is cheaper for them. They make more money. But I do believe residents…some people like that. But again, when we keep developing these green fields, who gets hit the hardest? Infill. Now, we are calling greenfield development infill somehow because it is continuous…continuous development, they call it or whatever. But even in some reports I am hearing now is, you know, a greenfield is actually infill. Well, it is not. It is really not. So, the infill comments that we have already talked about and reducing service costs, reusing. Getting money, for example, infill provides revenue for our neighbourhoods. Well, so far, I have learned it does not. So far, I have learned that we lose our LDR. We are not getting any more park money. We are falling apart at the inner cities and the mature neighbourhoods. But are we getting any kind of growth? No, we can not do an impact fee. That is out of the question. So, where is this money going to come from to develop these neighbourhoods to take those community centres that we have? Some firehalls we have? This is going to take quite a bit of…massive amount of work, but as we have seen, you know, with the cuts, that we do not have those infrastructures built into these new precincts. The inner…the mature neighbourhoods are paying for sprawl. We have to pay all that money out to put in new roads, new pipes, new community centres, because the developers are not. Maybe we need to change that. Again, I would love to see that happen, but right now, I do not believe that is even in the discourse because we do not want to have anybody intruding on developers ability to build new houses or to make good profits. Whatever way you want to put it. That is their job. Nothing disparaging about that. But our job is to make sure that the money that is being developed in growth areas. If we have a lot of growth in an infill community, they should be getting some money back to deal with that growth. Because even in our reports, repeatedly it says, and it hasn't changed any time soon. Two things that never change: one, is that the permit system should be a cost neutral. That should not be funded, as we found in the last budget, we decided to fund permits by using taxpayers' revenue. That should be a zero cost. That is from 2016. We also know from the impact fee that growth does not pay for growth. Again, there seems to be a change of philosophy. Never written down. Never a private policy discussion in Council. But that is what seems to be happening right now. So, again, the southwest interceptor will promote growth in the green fields. That is something, I think, we cannot afford to keep doing. So, that is why I think the idea of going to the mature neighbourhoods, investing in some of those mature neighbourhoods that are already experiencing problems, taking some of this money so it goes towards that is a good idea. So, I will be supporting both motions. But again, I will be very clear, that does not mean I am supporting when the by-law comes forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, you will notice from the very beginning of today's Council meeting starting with the Mayor's…with the Mayor's comments, opening comments, regarding his trip to the United States to the argument we are having right here, there is one consistent…one consistency in the whole conversation we have had all day so far, Madam Speaker. And we are talking about our inability to cope with inflation. What kind of inflation, Madam Speaker? Inflation of people's wages? No. It is the difference between people's wages and the inflation of the costs of things that wage earners need to pay for. That our working people need to pay for. Madam Speaker, we are not talking about all inflation going up, Madam Speaker. Because if everything went up, there would be no problem. Because if wages went up at the same rate as buses, cost of buses, there would be no problem. It could pay for it the same way. Madam Speaker, we will notice that the one consistency throughout the entire day so far has been our inability to agree on and therefore cope with inflation. Not all inflation because not everything is going up at the same rate, Madam Speaker. We are talking about, essentially, the inflation of capital assets. I have been calling it for 10 years here, since I have been here 10 years, essentially, construction inflation. Why do I mention construction inflation? Because that is the primary responsibility of this city's job to deal with our budget. We deal with construction more than we deal with houses or food. It is literally our job to build the bridges and the highways and to maintain them. So, Madam Speaker, when we can not explain to the taxpayers of this city why our budget is going up primarily due to construction inflation, the inflation of construction costs of bridges and roads. Who are we to try and cope with the issues of housing and food? Madam Speaker, when we can not even explain and cope with our own city budget, who are we to be able to handle the housing issue, the cost of housing? And the cost of food, as an example, Madam Speaker. You will notice, Madam Speaker, that this morning the mayor talked about how there is going to be an increase in the costs of goods coming in from the States, like buses or bus parts. Things like that, Madam Speaker, as an example. Construction costs. And Madam Speaker, this is what I have been talking about for 10 years. Am I exaggerating in any way, shape or form? Madam Speaker, Councillor Gilroy talked about how we are losing control. Well, that is true, Madam Speaker. We are losing control. But I have to make a point, Madam Speaker, that we moved a motion my first term to get a report on construction inflation. The council at the time chose not to know. Voted against the report…a robust report on construction inflation so that we all know what we are talking about. Madam Speaker, I am really scared that we are arguing and we do not even know what we are arguing about, Madam Speaker, because we do not even know the facts. So, Madam Speaker, talk about the cost of American imports, or we talk about the costs of goods and services…goods, primarily, not services. Because services are based on wages and salaries and they are not going up at the same rate. Let's face it. But of course, we might not all understand that, Madam Speaker, because we never offered to ourselves to have a report on inflation…on construction inflation so that we know the difference. We are talking about the Housing Accelerator Fund, Madam Speaker. Why are we talking about the Housing Accelerator Fund and the Canada Housing Initiative Fund? Why are we talking about giving up, de-

regulating and giving up power of council in order to get some federal funding for housing. Why is that, Madam Speaker? Because of the cost of housing. The cost of inflation of construction. Or is it for another reason? Nope, Madam Speaker. That is the reason. I have been talking about that for 10 years. Am I exaggerating? So, what are we supposed to do? Well, you can not solve a problem you can not understand, that you do not understand. You can not fix a problem you can not explain. And that is our job to understand it and to explain it. That is ours. And if it is not our job to do that, Madam Speaker, whose is it? I have asked for a report on construction inflation, it is been obfuscated. Well, there is already…there is already a report on construction inflation. I want to know where that report is. Madam Speaker, you know, in this room we debate and we argue with each other over statistics and this and that. And Councillor Orlikow just said he is confused by the administration about the meaning of four-plexes and four-storeys, and I do not blame him. We have got to get our facts straight, Madam Speaker, so we are all on the same page in terms of facts. We do not have to agree. We are all…we are entitled all to our own opinions and values and priorities. But Madam Speaker, when we can not even agree that we understand the facts of the same page, we are in trouble. And that is where we are right now. And I have been predicting this moment when Mayor Gillingham is saying the costs are going to be going up. Madam Speaker, the costs of the tariffs, potential tariffs coming in, because of our current politics here in the United States and it affects their largest economic trading partner, Canada. That is about four years of construction inflation. It sets us up four years in advance. But Madam Speaker, in the great scheme of things, it is bigger than that. And I am going to make the point, Madam Speaker, that these things are here to deflect and obfuscate and get us offtrack. Because it is a lot bigger than tariffs. That is not the main…that is not the main reason why we have got construction inflation. That is four years' worth, Madam Speaker. People have been on this council for 20 years. Well almost. We are a year away or something like that. Four years is not a long time when it comes to the history of economics, world history. So, it is very scary to me when we are going to talk about how it is the tariffs that are going to be the problem. Madam Speaker, if we actually knew what we were talking about, maybe we are in better position to absorb the shock and the challenges that this creates. But I am going to make the point that it is construction inflation itself that has caused the United States to look for some sort of answers. And they are looking at this. I hate to think that we are in death throws because we refuse to deal and talk about what is causing this. The consistency of today. The prices are going up…going to go up, says the mayor. First thing this morning we hear. Then we are talking about housing. Well, Madam Speaker, I am trying to deal with food inflation, Madam Speaker, in my ward of Elmwood-East Kildonan, and trying to get the best prices for people that I can. I am starting this. Really, a city councillor should not be doing that. It is not part of our thing. But well, you know, city councillor has to do what a city councillor has to do when it comes to trying to deal with inflation. I can not really do much as an individual, Madam Speaker, that takes government. That…that is more than one person. I will do what I can in my area to try and get the best prices for people for food. I am working on it right now. That is a big issue. Because it is not…you know, although construction inflation is the biggest issue here when it comes to the City's budget, food is actually a larger part of people's budget, Madam Speaker. Let's get on the same page. Let's…

Madam Speaker: …Thank you, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Pardon me?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, the time is up. Shall we move on? Thank you. No further speakers? Councillor Duncan, last speaker, then we will close.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise, more so, I thought this was fairly straightforward. We are requesting 150 million dollars from a federal grant to go towards essentially lessening the cost to ratepayers, ultimately, in the 279 million dollars that is allocated and approved for the water and sewer rate reports. Unfortunately, you know, I do not want to get into the real, you know, ins and outs of this. I see a lot of eyes rolling back into heads in the gallery this morning and around the table. But when we speak to transparency on…let me just make sure I get this day correct. February 18th, this information was circulated to all of Council. I saw a response from the councillor from St. Vital on this and there were answers given, including that if we are successful in this application of 150 million from the feds, 150 million would come more from the Province of Manitoba, or there approximately, which could result in 21 million dollars being applied to those sewer rates. Which could see, to the councillor from Fort Rouge-Fort Garry, affordability. A reduction 1.5 percent to those rates. The southwest interceptor is ready to go. Mission is not. There are criterias to these applications, including a 100 million dollar cap, which Mission would exceed. To my Council colleagues considering this, it is not eligible. I love hearing about the times of the past, but I think it is time that we look to the future and how we can get things done in this city. And that is making decisions here today that impact the future of our sewer at the North End and protecting folks' pockets when it comes to their rates and affordability in this province. 150 million dollars to start with would go a long way. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes to close on the motion and main item. Your opportunity to speak, thank you.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, we have had everyone who has ever chaired the Water and Waste Committee in its history, now it is me. So, thank you to Councillor Duncan for doing that. Councillor Eadie, Councillor Gilroy and myself, of course. So, no, you were not Chair of that committee, you were Chair of Public Works when that was under the committee, yeah. So, no. It is important to clarify what is actually on the table here. There are two housing programs that have been referenced here. Confusingly, the CHF, the CHIF and the H-A-F, the HAF; both federal programs. So, we are debating here today the CHIF. Making an application…the idea that you are turning down 150 million dollars, no, this is about making an application under the CHIF to get 150 million dollars. Oh, there are complaints about transparency, and yet, you have had nine days to ask it. There is no federal provincial stream yet in existence that we are applying under. There is no deal with the Province of Manitoba. Where is it? It does not exist. It will probably be announced after the Transcona by-election, I suspect, and then we will all be told how water and sewer rates are going to come down, but that is merely supposition. So, let's be clear, there is no federal provincial stream with rules and regulations. We are saying we have to get our application in, so be it. It is an application for 150 million dollars that does not start until after the federal election. The announcement in the fall economic statement, spread that over four years starting in 2026. So, that is what we are debating here. We are not turning down 150, we are making an application for 150 for the biosolids. So, with all due respect to Councillor Duncan, the transparency here is not, perhaps, quite what it could be since we do not know what the terms of the deal is with the Province. So, regardless, I would support applying for 150. There is one person who comes out looking good out of this whole process and that person is Matt Dryburgh who is our interim acting assistant deputy. Matt Dryburgh is our…is the Interim Deputy to Sherwood over there. So, why do I say that? Because he's got a paragraph in here that says, instead of having a fight to the death in March over the four units as of right, we are going to go with what we said in 2023 and we are going to have that hearing in June. We are going to have that hearing in June under the Housing Accelerator Fund about four-plexes and that will be that. So, we are not having two separate debates here. So, Councillor Orlikow is right. I am not voting for all sorts of detail here today on the four-plexes. Councillor Lukes says infill, infill. The proposal is four units as of right city-wide. We had a whole debate about the infill guidelines about promoting infill in the mature communities, pre-1960 communities, because that is where the population had been lost over time. That is where we wanted to focus, closer to downtown. This is not that. Let's not pretend it is. This is four units everywhere across the entire city. All of them could be built in Sage Creek. All of them could be built in Waverley West. All of them could be as far out as you could get in the city. None of this has to do with infill or densification or affordability. It is just the Federal Government, as Gilroy correctly says, bullying the City into saying, you have to agree to four units as of right. What are the details? As…to the credit of Mr. Dryburgh, we are going to sort that out in June. Okay, so the idea that…and this idea that, oh, you oppose lot splits. That is not multi-family. I know I am right on that because the sewer by-law backs me up. So, all of the lot splits that have happened, none of…it is all a fog machine. None of that has to do with multi-family housing. Turning to the merits of the amendment, so we are trying to promote infill. So, we are going to go with the southwest interceptor down by the perimeter to promote more housing development in the southwest corner of the city, but we are not going to go with the work in the Mission district, which is…if you are wondering where that is, it is around Happyland Pool and Park, ironically. If that is where the Mission district is. That would be in a mature community. That would actually fit our definition of infill. Councillor Orlikow is right. We are talking infill in Sage Creek, Waverley West, distant parts of Transcona. And suddenly, that has become infill, but it is in the greenfield area. Very confusing, but that is really the debate for June, I would say. But for today, you can not get up here and say, we need more housing that is infill, so vote for the southwest interceptor over the Mission district thing because one is at the extreme southwest corner and the other one is in the mature community. That just does not hang together. I support the southwest interceptor. Lukes is right, we have already got the funding for it. We do. So, what does this…what does this come down to, really? So, if we are really talking about housing and promoting housing, I would suggest to move on this southwest interceptor, switching that out and putting in some CSO work would make more sense. That would be my submission. But that takes away and is a bit of a distraction from the main application which is around trying to get the 150 million for the biosolids. I won't get into some of the points Councillor Wyatt has made. But what this really comes down to, in terms of the amendment, you can say how important the CSO work is. You can. You can say, but I am not going to ask the Federal Government for money today for that. And then, we are going to get in about a month's time, into a debate about rates. And I am going to say, well, since we are not asking the other levels of government to help us, we are going to have to go it alone. And you are going to say, no, I do not want to do that. I want to blame the other levels of government. You can do that, but then, just be honest. Just say, I want to be done in 2095. I want to leave this for my children's children's children to sort out the whole sewer spill. That is what I want to do because it is…it is inarguable that we are going from 45 million a year down to 30 million in the budget to deal with CSO. It is inarguable that the costing says, if you are going to be done even by the 2090s, you have got to be at 30 million a year in 2019 dollars. So, construction inflation, inflation period is slipping away from us there. So, the debate is not over today, we will be back in a month's time on those water and sewer rates. And maybe Councillor Duncan's actually scored a point here with this, hey, maybe we can lower the rates because we will be getting all this federal and provincial money. Although, we do not know how much provincial money, but let's assume we do. Oh, so maybe we will have a little bit more room under the rate structure and we can actually do Mission. We can actually do some of the other CSO work. So, you can say it today, as Councillor Eadie does, it is very important to do CSO work. Fine. You can say today, but I do not ask the other level of government to help pay for it, even though that is been the deal since 2003 that they are supposed to be. No, no, I do not want to ask them. But then you better vote for a higher rate so we can actually get going on this. Or you have the third choice, I am going to

stand up and claim I want to be done by 2045, but really, I want to be done by 2095. And if you want to leave that for generations to come, go ahead, but I am going to try and call you out on it. So, you can vote against this today, I suppose. But let's come back in a month. If you do not want other levels of government to help with this CSO work, then we better fund the CSO work. That is really the debate. So, maybe this is part one. But in any event, my thanks to Mr. Dryburgh for coming up with a rather elegant compromise in terms of the four units as of right in that. So, I am supporting of the amendment and I will be supporting the report as a whole. Thank you.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, ultimately, this comes down to one thing. The Federal Government has put money on the table, potentially, that we can access. There are applications that have rules and conditions spelled out in the applications for the CHIF, the Canada Housing Infrastructure Funds, the two streams. Our staff has looked at the comprehensive work that is to be done, all projects, and brought forward their recommendation as to which projects we should apply for. Projects that meet the criteria laid out in the application. The question is this: do we as a Council want to risk not accessing that federal money? I, for one, will not do that because then that lands on the backs of ratepayers. The staff was asked the question, and Councillor Duncan pointed it out, I am looking now at the e-mail that was sent to all councillors from Mr. Armbruster, our CAO, Interim CAO. And the question that was asked, why is the southwest interceptor being proposed as the City's project under the direct stream? The answer: the southwest interceptor is being proposed as a project under the direct stream because it meets the program criteria of supporting new housing development and has already been approved by Council in the capital budget and five-year capital forecast to be funded by retained earnings within the water and sewer utility. And if the City is successful in securing the federal funding for this project, it could help to reduce future sewer rate increases. The staff had a whole host of projects they could choose from for which they would apply to the Canada Housing Infrastructure Fund direct stream. And they brought forward, in their professional experience and opinion, the southwest interceptor because it meets the criteria. Two of the criteria in the application projects must be at least one million dollars and should not exceed 100 million dollar in total project eligible costs and even the amending motion here projects a Mission, a CSO project cost of 150 million. So, far exceeding what could be approved within criteria. And it also, in the application terms and conditions it says that criteria application should demonstrate a high level of project readiness. Projects must be substantially complete by 2031. Staff has indicated to me just recently here throughout the debate that the CSO project is about reducing sewer load in established neighbourhoods, but is not directly required to increase housing supply in that area, whereas the southwest interceptor directly does go towards new housing supply. And the motion itself indicates the CSO project exceeds the eligible costs as outlined in the criteria. It would be, frankly, a waste of ink to apply for this CSO project through the CHIF stream. The sewer rate report is coming. We all know it is coming. I know this; I and I know and every member of Council, wants to do all we can to maintain affordability. Full stop. I do not think there is anyone here that wants to do anything other than help Winnipeggers make sure we can do all we can to maintain affordability in light of this. Onto the topic of frustration with the federal government. I will remind everybody that what this federal government has done right now, yes, rules and conditions on housing and getting money out the door through the Housing Accelerator Fund. Our city has grown by 71,000 people in the last three years which is putting tremendous pressure on all aspects of our services, housing supply, water and sewer supply, all of that is under great, great pressure. But this federal government, like it or not, and I do not like, certainly, everything that has been done, has provided a housing accelerator fund, transit fund, the CHIF direct stream, the CHIF territorial provincial stream, all to try to help cities and municipalities build housing and businesses and continue to accommodate the needs that we have in our infrastructure. They put conditions on all of their funding. Conditions that we do not love. Conditions, frankly, we do not like. I heard some councillors say, really pushing back hard. Do not blame you. The leader of the opposition has said not only if he gets to power will he cancel the Housing Accelerator Fund and cancel the…both streams CHIF and cancel the transit fund, but he will put conditions on the very next thing we are about to vote on: the former gas tax, which really, right now has very little conditions. We have a lot of autonomy as to how we allocate that gas tax. There was a private member's motion by Pierre Poilievre last year or two years ago in September of, I think it was 2023, that would put conditions on the municipalities getting the gas tax. Cancel all the other funds that are on the table right now and put conditions. The bottom line is, no matter, apparently, who is in power in Ottawa, there is conditions on our funding. Come back to this right now, we have the offer, potential offer, of 31 million dollars for the southwest interceptor if we can get it and the 150 million dollars for biosolids on the north…the North End Sewage Treatment Plant. To the councillor from Transcona's frustration with why are we building biosolids? Because, and I have got it open right now, the Save Lake Winnipeg Act says that is what we have to build. The Save Lake Winnipeg Act says, nutrient removal must be achieved primarily by biological methods, your application of the best available technologies. The use of chemical methods to remove nutrients must be minimized. That is right in the law. We are building the plant we are building because the law says we have to build it that way to comply with provincial regulations. So, we are bound. We have an audit that has just been done on the northwest inter…the northwest plant that shows us the path forward, how we can do a better job in the future to make sure we have got the right sized governance, a fit-for-purpose governance model. And we as a Council are going to be implementing those recommendations. We are going to vote on something in just a few moments under Councillor Eadie's committee to make sure that we are implementing the recommendations of that audit. The first of some of the recommendations of that audit. What has happened, Council, is this; is that the North End Sewage Treatment Plant,

the North End water pollution control centre, the North End plant, is a project that has been talked about for years and years and years and years. And it is kind of like this Council has been handed a grenade, the pin of which has been pulled. It is all coming down to us right now. We happen to be the Council of the day. Timing is everything and here we are. Previous federal governments, provincial governments, many of the previous Councils deferred, did not make decisions on this, dragged their heals and all of it now lands on us all at the same time. A growing city of 71,000 people growth in the last three years, the North End plant that has limited capacity, four to six years left, the need…the desperate need to get that plant built. The CSO work that has to be done. The southwest interceptor, which is a back up pipe, by the way. Right now, do not forget, folks, we have a pipe…temporary pipe running over a bridge in south Winnipeg. We have got to fund this pipe. We have got to fund this southwest interceptor. All of it is on us right now, but that is the burden of this day. That is the burden of this hour. And I am calling us to do all we can to make sure we can access as much federal and provincial funding as possible. If I can get another minute.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer moved extension, one minute. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mayor Gillingham: What does it say to our federal and provincial partners if today we monkey around with this application and risk losing the money that is being potentially put on the table for us. And then, go to them tomorrow and say, oh, by the way, we messed up on that one, but could you give us more for the North End plant? Could you give us more for roads? Could you give us more for something else? They would say, Council, you blew it. Let's focus here today on what is before us. This is not a vote on fours…this is not a vote on four units as of right. That is not what this vote is. This vote today is about two funding programs that have been put on the table. We have been invited to apply. The application has rules and conditions around it. Our staff has said these two projects meet the application rules and conditions. They give us the opportunity potentially to access federal funding. So, to me, that is what we need to do. So, I am asking us to vote for the main motion and I will not be supporting the amending motion because I do not want to risk potentially not accessing federal funding.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I will call the question on amending Motion 1. That was moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Orlikow. All in favour of that motion, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Schreyer, Wyatt.

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 5, Nays 9.

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

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Wyatt.

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

Madam Speaker: Item 2 passes. Next item, Madam Clerk.

Item 3 – Municipal Canada Community-Building Fund Agreement

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And we do have an amending motion with this item. Or a motion to refer, pardon me. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to introduce the item.

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, Madam Speaker. Just reading…sorry. Just…I know the motion was just…the amending motion was distributed while we were debating the last one…

Madam Speaker: …Yes. We will have an opportunity to debate it right after it is introduced. You can wait till then.

Mayor Gillingham: Okay, I will speak to the amending motion then. I have not even seen it, had a chance to read it. I will speak to it in my close. Yes, what Item 3 is, is really what I just actually referenced a moment ago, and that is the Municipal Canada Community Building Fund, was formerly known as the gas tax, and we understand it as the gas tax. The requirements on that is that every…every 10 years, I believe, we are required to sign a new agreement with the…in regards to that fund. And so, it is time to sign that agreement. As I said a moment ago, what this is, is it is a fund from the federal government. It is a gas tax fund that is disbursed from the Federal Government to municipalities. The City of Winnipeg relies upon that funding for a lot of our capital projects, key capital projects. You will see within in our capital budget when it says 'funding sources' on each budget page, you will see from time-to-time, it will say that the Municipal Canada Community Building Fund is a funding source within our capital program and our capital projects. It is a very, very important fund. And so, to have a signed agreement on this is vital to make sure that those funds continue to flow to the City of Winnipeg so we can allocate them, use them and invest them within our city.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Just for process so there is a clear understanding; Councillor Wyatt, it is motion to refer is what you have on the table? Yes, I will get to that. Yeah, with instructions. Councillor Schreyer is the seconder. So, your opportunity to speak and then we will have debate just on the referral motion, not the main item. Councillor Wyatt.

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

WHEREAS the National Gas Tax Fund, in real dollars, has been dropping in value due to construction inflation that is above, typically, the 2% for inflation, now budgeted for in the existing program;

AND WHEREAS construction inflation has consistently exceeded the inflation rate commonly referred to at 2%;

AND WHEREAS the Gas Tax Fund is used to fund infrastructure projects that have experienced inflation cost pressures annually that have been consistently above 2% inflation.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED Item 3 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee be referred back for the purpose of negotiating an annual indexing rate that reflects the actual national average, of any given year, of the inflation increase in road and bridge construction inflation for the renewed Gas Tax funding program and that the said indexing shall be directly linked to said National average increase in road and bridge construction inflation.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker, for clarifying that. I would just like to say, Mr. Poilievre, though it is predicted he may be the future prime minister, he is not the prime minister yet. And we do not know what's going to happen in the next couple of months federally. But I think we should go on always attempting to get the best deal for the city. And that is why this motion is being moved, similar to the debate we just had. That the existing gas tax fund as we know it is a function of a number of things with regards to per capita. Manitoba's share overall, as a share of the national population, does not…typically has not kept up. We have actually seen a decline and more people exiting the province in the last year or so than arriving compared to other provinces like Alberta or Ontario. Which means that our share of the entire gas tax fund as a province drops. But the other pressure on the gas tax fund, and I am going to refer to it as that, even though the federal government calls it something new, is the fact that we have inflation, as we all know, with regards to roads inflation and construction, that typically, at least in this city and province, and I think it is fair to say in most jurisdictions across the country, has exceeded the national inflation rate which typically has, thankfully, been managed to be kept low or at least recently brought down. And what does that mean, Madam Speaker? Similar to the example I just gave with regards to our overall percentage of the Canadian population, Manitoba's share of that, slowly declining. Hopefully that changes in the future. This, too, Madam Speaker, eats away at our ability to give a…to deliver projects. Why? Because at a two percent rate of indexing, the cost of inflation of actual construction, which is what this program is used for, drops in terms of real dollar value of what we can actually deliver. And why is this so important with regards to the gas tax fund? Because council many years ago, and this Council continues the policy, has benchmarked so many public/private partnerships as a function of this value of this fund. Which means that as the fund drops in overall value so, too, is the pinch on our ability to do more

P3s going forward until you retire a P3 after 25 or 30 years or whatever the case of the term may be. Now, what is being proposed here is unique. Maybe something that has not been contemplated, but it is something that we should really be putting on the table. I would like to add, Madam Speaker, that it was this city, it was Mayor Norrie who actually moved the motion in this Council Chamber that went on to the federal…the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to call for gas tax funding to be back to the municipalities. We led the country that became national policy. It took about 20, 25 years, but it actually happened. It started right here in Winnipeg. So, it is very appropriate today that we therefore make a suggestion to take it back. And what better time now to take it back to a federal government that is on the eve of a potential election. That is…a federal Liberal Party that is scrambling to find their new leader. And in fact, a leader who, by the way, in the event that it is the person they are predicting it may be who will be the leader of the Liberal Party, if anybody understands inflation and the impact of inflation on budgets, it is Mr. Carney of all people. You know, former Head of the Bank of Canada appointed, no less, by Mr. Harper, a conservative. So, you know, I think it is appropriate for us to also lead with regards to renegotiating the program. And yes, from the federal perspective, their concern is going to be that this is not just a Winnipeg negotiation. This will have national implications right across the country. Well, so be it. So be it. Municipalities of Winnipeg has been feeling the pinch on construction inflation and every other municipality is feeling it as well at their ratepayers. And what this would do, to the point, and this was the brilliance of Councillor Schreyer, is to bring a national spotlight on the issue of road construction that maybe it would actually have the effect that we would want, which is to bring down inflation in that industry to levels that are acceptable as they are in every other industry. Because so far, they do not seem to be concerned about that. They…I am sure the construction industry would argue differently if they were here today. Mr. Lorenc and company. And I like Chris a lot. He is a great guy. But the reality is, it does not seem to be when it comes to their actual policy and delivering their industry in terms of projects coming forward on an annual basis on the tenders they bid, it does not seem to be high priority based on the inflation rates. And so, Madam Speaker, this would bring attention to the issue nationally. It would put pressure on the industry to find ways to bring down their costs so that they could deliver a more efficient product to their customers. And in this case, the customers across this country, municipal jurisdictions, the thousands that exist in this country who, on a regular basis, annually tender out road and bridge construction. This would be a very positive, therefore, development. In fact, in the first few years if this were to be amended as part of the program going forward, I would dare say that we would probably see road construction inflation brought down in line based on the fact that the pressure from the federal government be so great. Nothing is assuming, by the way, Madam Speaker. This motion does not assume that this implies an increase in gas tax. The federal government could make up the difference out of their general revenues, which they have more than enough of. They seem to do that with the CPP and every other program, so why couldn't they do it with this? This would bring pressure on the industry to bring their costs down, but in the interim, it would ensure that municipalities like the city of Winnipeg are not seeing the value for money dropping every year as it has been since this program was created thanks to Mayor Norrie moving that motion on the floor of Council so many years ago that became FCM policy. That was finally adopted as a national program. So, those are my thoughts behind the motion. I want to thank Councillor Schreyer as the seconder and for being so consistent and correct…and absolutely correct with regards to his consistency with regards to the issue of construction inflation. Which, by the way, has eaten away at our capital budget. If you run the numbers, not millions, not tens of millions, but hundreds of millions of value out of our capital budget that we will never get again. What we can do about it, though, is going forward to address the issue so that it does not continue at the present rate. Because even at the one and one percent that we dedicate for local roads and regional roads, that, too, is falling behind with regards to the fact that construction inflation keeps eating away at that program, as well. So, just wanted to put this motion out there. I hope that a referral can be considered and voted on and supported. Give us a little bit more time. Take it back to the federal government. Debate…take it and say, you know, my Council…I am sorry, Mr. Prime Minister, I am sorry Mr. Minister, my Council has pushed me on this. I got to take it back. Blame Council and take it back and push the federal government to do better at a time when the clock is ticking down on their political lifetime. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, opportunity to debate the referral motion. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Gillingham: Okay, do I get to…

Madam Speaker: It is open debate, yes.

Mayor Gillingham: Okay, Councillor Eadie wants to go then.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Eadie. Just…just debate on the referral motion only.

Councillor Eadie: I am standing to speak to the amending motion and the…

Madam Speaker: Yes, so it is not an amending motion, it is a motion to refer. So, it would be sending, as stated. Maybe we should read this…actually, I am going to ask the Clerk to read the referral motion into the record.

Clerk: Moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Schreyer:. Whereas the National Gas Tax Fund in real dollars, has been dropping in value due to construction inflation that is above, typically, the two percent for inflation now budgeted for in the existing program; And whereas construction inflation has consistently exceeded the inflation rate commonly referred to at two percent; And whereas the Gas Tax Fund is used to fund infrastructure projects that have experienced inflation cost pressures annually that have been consistently above two percent inflation; Therefore be it resolved, Item 3 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee be referred back for the purpose of negotiating an annual indexing rate that reflects the actual national average, of any given year, of the inflation increase in road and bridge construction inflation for the renewed Gas Tax funding program and that the said indexing shall be directly linked to the said…to said national average increase in road and bridge construction inflation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor…I think the Mayor had his hand up first. Okay, Councillor Eadie? Or is it you, Mr. Mayor? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: So, it is fully debatable this one?

Madam Speaker: This referral motion, yes.

Councillor Eadie: So, it is fully debatable?

Madam Speaker: That is right.

Councillor Eadie: I am just rising. I really…it is actually a…the part to refer is not good. I am not sure why we do not have a separate motion that calls on the City of Winnipeg to work with AMM and FCM to lobby for that indexing that is, actually, if it was indexed, is beneficial to everyone. So, I do not know why we would refer back report Item 3 when what they are proposing is going to take some time and should be handled differently. Thanks.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am not going to support referral. We want to make sure we get this signed. But just, Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Schreyer are not wrong. As we know, the gas tax allocation of the Canada Community Building Fund, the two percent index does not keep up with the rising cost of inflation. So, I think Councillor Eadie was right on the money and that is what I just went over to talk to Councillor Wyatt about, is that I think, perhaps, the way we could get at this is to, you know, if Mayor Norrie did…the Council did of the day, we would use kind of the same mechanism where we as a Council consider a motion, I think Councillor Wyatt will draft shortly, that would be separate from this that really calls upon AMM and FCM to lobby the federal government and the federal opposition, as well, to consider increasing the indexing beyond the two percent that more accurately reflects the rising costs that we are facing in the City of Winnipeg. Because I just do not think that even negotiating with the federal government, I am confident they would not provide a carve out specifically on a national program, they would not provide a carve out for Winnipeg. It would be a difficult negotiation. But if we use the collective power of the Federation of the Canadian Municipalities and AMM to try to help the federal government understand the need that we have for something above two percent in the indexing, I think we would have…more likely to have success on that.

Councillor Wyatt: …Has indicated…and, of course, with the support of my seconder, I would be amenable to having the motion that were before us. But rather than the sake of debating a motion…

Madam Speaker: …Like to rescind it?

Councillor Wyatt: Well, I would suggest withdrawing. As long the understanding is, and I thank the Mayor for his words, that it would be the same 'be it resolved', but you could build the 'whereas' clauses leading up about the FCM and so on. And the mover being the Mayor would be honourable. I know he wants me to move it, but I think it would be better if it was himself and I would second that.

Madam Speaker: Okay, very good, thank you…

Councillor Wyatt: …If Councillor Schreyer is amenable to withdrawing the motion...

Madam Speaker: …With the concurrence of Councillor Schreyer as the seconder.

Councillor Chambers: Discussion on this issue…

Madam Speaker: …We will go back to the discussion on the main item, but I see some collaboration on a different motion through FCM, as we just heard.

Councillor Schreyer: On that basis, yeah, I do concur to…

Councillor Wyatt: …As long as we can get it here this week.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, so we are…you are in concurrence to rescind? I have got the Chair, please. Thank you. All in favour of rescinding? Okay. Councillor Wyatt had motion to rescind this motion.

Councillor Wyatt: I believe the staff are going to work on the motion over lunch and will bring that before the EPC items are dealt with so that it would be part of that report…

Madam Speaker: …Okay, thank you. Councillor Schreyer in agreement to rescind this, but we will still carry on in a different way.

Councillor Schreyer: Based on the comments that the Mayor and Councillor Wyatt were allowed to say, yes.

Madam Speaker: Very good. Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now, back to the main item. We will go to speakers. Councillor Wyatt…Councillor Schreyer, do you wish to speak…

Councillor Schreyer: …Sure…

Madam Speaker: …We are speaking on the main…

Councillor Schreyer: …Yes, but it is in relationship to the…to the amendment...

Madam Speaker: …That is fine. Go ahead…

Councillor Schreyer: …And, of course, the amendment is related to the motion, so I can not…would not assume that my comments would be out of order.

Madam Speaker: You are fine. Go ahead.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just comments in terms of what His Worship has said. Not necessarily…it is not necessarily…it is not in the wording. I made a point of stating that the amendment we had had here, that we had…that Councillor Wyatt and I had constructed. Made a point to Councillor Wyatt that it does not state, in fact, an increase of the gas tax. I know…I understand that His Worship has just stated now that he would like to see an increase in the gas tax or whatever the term is. I hope we understand what we are all talking about here. My point, in order to second that referral motion, was that it said that the gas tax would be geared to construction inflation. It does not say that it would be an increase. But let's face it, Madam Speaker, let's be realistic, let's be upfront. Of course, the problem is because it has been construction inflation every single year in our adult life has been at a greater increase than the increase in the wages and salaries of the taxpayers that pay for construction, Madam Speaker. So, when we have talked here in terms of rising inflation, Madam Speaker, we have to be specific, because not everything rises at the same time…at the same rate. If we did…if it did, we would not have inflation problems. So, when we say the rise in costs of inflation, Madam Speaker, that does not make sense to us. We can not be work with that because we do not know what inflation we are talking about. We do not have a rising cost of inflation and everything be equal. So, when we say rising inflation, rising inflation of what? In this case, I believe, because the Mayor has said rising cost of inflation. Well, not the rising cost of inflation of peoples wages and salaries. Essentially, of middle-class, working-class people. No. We are talking about the rising cost of construction inflation, Madam Speaker. That is what we are referring to. Not the rising cost of inflation, the rising cost of construction inflation. Let's be clear. And if we are not clear about that, Madam Speaker, let's get a report on it so we all know what we are talking about. I have been asking for eight years. And let's face it, before the end of this term, it is going to happen again. Hopefully this time we will all get it. I think we are getting it, Madam Speaker. It has always been there, always the case and it is getting worse every year. It does not increase at a rate of two percent or three percent or four percent or five percent more than people…than the taxpayers' income every year because it is not an arithmetic progression, Madam Speaker, it is a geometric progression. It gets worse and worse and worse and worse and worse every year. Madam Speaker, I will give you an example. This is what I mean. It is just one example and there is many ways to explain it, but here is one. Because here is one some people understand in terms of when you go from the base good of something and then it becomes wholesale then retail. And in two steps in…the cost might increase by 40 percent. 40 percent to wholesale and another 40 percent to retail. Is that an increase of 80 percent, Madam Speaker? No. That is an increase of about 100 percent. That is a doubling of the price. You increase the thing by 40 percent, and

then you increase that by 40 percent. That is a doubling from the original cost. That is 100 percent increase. So, Madam Speaker, it is just an indication of how…of how geometric progressions work when it comes to inflation. That is just a really a simple one, Madam Speaker. But when you take the difference between the inflation of taxpayers' income and you compare that over years to the rate of construction costs that taxpayers have to pay for, if the rate of inflation is double that, something like that, let's say people's income increases at two percent a year and construction inflation is at around five percent a per year, Madam Speaker. It is not a difference of three percent a year, Madam Speaker. After a decade or two, we are talking about…well, after, Madam Speaker, after, you know, 30, 40 years, we are talking about something that is in the magnitude of 10 times the increase. And that is what I am talking about, Madam Speaker. I have been told in this room that my statistics are completely inaccurate. And I have stated…I offer this yet again, Madam Speaker, that if my statistics are completely inaccurate, and they are not mine, they come from Statistics Canada and the Bank of Canada, but that I am…I will resign, or I just won't run again. Because I do not belong here if I am wrong about construction inflation. I do not belong in this…in this Council Chamber. But Madam Speaker, I have got to say, in this…and I will say it again, in the same speech in which I was told my statistics were completely inaccurate, we were being asked for a new stream, we were being asked to ask for a new stream of revenue to sustain the construction…the city's construction industry, our construction budget, to ask for more money from the Province and/or the Federal Government. Madam Speaker, I was saying 10 years ago that our construction budget is unsustainable. So, how could it be if my statistics are not…that are completely inaccurate, that my prediction has come true in that very speech because Chris Lorenc asked for a new stream of funding in order to sustain the City's construction budget. That is what I was talking about. So, how could I be completely right and completely wrong at the same time? Madam Speaker, you know, we can be out. We all disagree on certain things. And we are out by different perceptions of margins. Really, depends on where you get your statistics, as well, Madam Speaker. And when people can correct me, Madam Speaker, I said, on the…on the issues of the city budget, when I am inaccurate and I can be shown how I am inaccurate, I will publicly thank them. If I am completely inaccurate, I will resign. Anyway, Madam Speaker, let's get it straight in terms of what inflation we are talking about. If all inflation was equal, we would have no inflation. Madam Speaker, inflation merely means the difference between the cost of something and our ability to pay for it. That is what we are talking about. So, let's not talk about the rise in cost of inflation. Let's not use that term. It does not make sense. We can not understand that because it is not the realty of it, Madam Speaker. Inflation means when something goes up higher than your ability to pay for it. That is inflation. That is relative. It is relative inflation. And in fact, that is what inflation is. Otherwise, Madam Speaker, we are just talking. Thank you. Merci. Megwich.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? No further speakers? Okay. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good discussion. And I think, as I said, we…separate from this, we are working on another motion that is kind of related to that, but it is just being drafted right now. So, with that, though, I will call the question on this Item No. 3 which is, really, to enter into a new agreement so that the federal funding to the City of Winnipeg continues to flow. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We will now recess and reconvene at 1:30 sharp. Okay. Some folks are asking for 1:00. Okay. 1:15, okay? Can we compromise? 1:15. Thank you to Joanne Kelly, once again. Instructor and her class for sticking with us and being here all morning. Thank you so much

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
February 27, 2025, at 1:25 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of February 27th, 2025. Afternoon session of this Council meeting. And I would like to welcome back Joanne Kelly, instructor, for journalism students, Red River College, who are, once again, joining us. They were with us all morning. Eagerly awaiting exciting debate. We are on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 27th. Madam Clerk.

Item 8 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 22 Granite Way – DASZ 46/2024

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am going to wait for my colleagues on this one. I am sure there will be lots of discussion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker, I was the one who stood this down. So, thank you. I was part of the hearing body that heard this matter. And I just want to put my comments on the record briefly. I think it is fair to say that we all want to see affordable housing wherever possible. The concern that I had was how a, I guess, a not-for-profit organization that has had a long history in our city, has done an amazing job operating, coming back from the pandemic where they dropped down to as low as 800 members. They got themselves up to about 1,200, 1,400 members again post-pandemic. A lot of not-for-profit groups, especially recreational groups, service clubs, never came back after the pandemic. They have. And, knowing how we under-fund recreation in our city, we need all of the help we can get when it comes for not-for-profits operating rec facilities in our city. And yes, the City of Winnipeg does technically own the facility and the land known as the parking lot on the western side of the building that is the subject of this matter. It is my belief that, you know, we do want an ideal society where we do not necessarily have to drive the car. But the reality is, we do not have that right now. And if you take away an organization's parking, especially a not-for-profit that is trying to keep themselves alive by attracting people to come use their facility, I think it has a big impact on them. I was happy to see the EPC amendment that was made. But I am still concerned that this is a matter…I felt that it should have been…the onus should have been on the other foot. It should have been on the proposal proponents to find solutions to the parking issue versus making the Granite Curling Club and all their volunteers – and they are all volunteers – to have to scramble to try to address this. And it might be just as simple as somebody like the Mayor picking up the phone and calling up Canada Life executive, CEO, and saying, hey, we need to use your parking in the evening and weekends when you are really not using it. And yeah, they'll do…they will sign a cross-liability policy for their insurance policy if that is the issue that you have, concerned about somebody slipping and falling in your parking lot or what have you. But the concern I have, Madam Speaker, is that we really have, you know, taken an organization for granted that I do not think we should. They have done amazing work. They continue to do. And you know, curling, whether you are a curler or not, Manitoba is known for being kind of the curling central of the world, so to speak. And, again, I guess we get to take that sport for granted, too. I just think there could have been a more cooperative way of approaching it. I heard a lot during the hearing, you know, I heard a lot of hubris and kind of arrogance coming out of the proponents that I did not really appreciate. I felt, you know, they had the sense that they had the…you know, the bit between the knees…

Councillor Rollins: …Point of order, Madam Speaker. We are not supposed to be impugning the motives or the character. In this case, Madam Speaker, the applicant was a City of Winnipeg, our very own staff. And so, I would like him to retract his statements, Madam Speaker, if you can convince him to do that and upstand…and make sure that we are…we are acting with decorum…

Madam Speaker: …Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Thank you. If you could…

Councillor Wyatt: …Fair enough, Madam Speaker. I retract my last statement…

Madam Speaker: …Rephrase that...

Councillor Wyatt: …But I can tell you that…Let's put it this way. I wish there would have been greater cooperation, and I still think that even at this point it is still possible, hopefully, with the amendment coming forward that can address that. But the EPC amendment that was made at EPC…but I do believe that it does put the curling club, really, in a position of scrambling to address their ongoing viability. And keep in mind, Madam Speaker, the practice that we have had with regards to real estate in the city. Typically, what we have done in the past is an organization who has had a long-term lease and use of land is usually offered…given the first right of refusal to either extend the lease or purchase the land. That was not done in this situation for some reason. And we did…as a Council did not...and it was learned during the hearing that somehow staff are directed to begin the ball rolling on this process in the summer of last year when Council did not give the authority to the Public Service to sole source until September…at the end of September of 2024. And yet, the architect was already hired by the University of Winnipeg CRC in the summer. They…when I asked the question that was really given in the meeting of the proponent. Meetings were already underway in the summer. And we have had now, I do not want to say how many real estate audits, that have strongly said, thou shalt not do that. Sole sourcing, you have to allow for there to be a public bid process. And there are a couple of occasions; the early audit back in 2000-2001 done…then implemented by Mayor Glenn Murray. There are occasions where we may…

Councillor Rollins: …Madam Speaker, this is whispering and breathless. The City was the applicant. So, when we are saying that there is smoke and there is mirrors, we are whispering and we are breathless, Madam Speaker. But we are…what we…what we did not…what the councillor is not considering is the Council votes that led the Public Service…

Councillor Wyatt: …That is not a point of order...

Councillor Rollins: …To do the council things. And by saying that we are...

Madam Speaker: …Councillor Rollins, thank you…

Councillor Rollins: …Contrary to audits, doing things illegally. Who is the applicant, Madam Speaker? It was the City of Winnipeg.

Councillor Wyatt: And it is the City of Winnipeg who should follow the rules more than anybody else. And they should actually lead by example. I have read the audits. I was here when the audits were done. I came here right after that audit was done by Glenn Murray and it was specifically given to me by then Ray Klassen, the head of the Real Estate Division. You have to read these recommendations, councillor, and you have got to know them by heart. And I had them on my posterboard for the longest time in my office. And there…to my point, before I was interrupted, was that you can sole source if there is a greater good, but it has to be declared in advance by Council. We did not do that from what I can see, that…and maybe I am wrong. If somebody can point that out, I would be more than happy to say I was wrong. We did not delegate authority to the Public Service to do anything on this property in terms of…not just this property, but anything regarding the HAF up until September of last year. But the staff were acting before that. Now, maybe there is some other clause that could be pointed to and some previous report that gave them the authority, then wonderful. Show that to me where it specifically gave them authority to do this on this property. But Madam Speaker, right now, I have great concerns about that. And I just, the Granite Curling Club, great organization. Does wonderful work in the city. Amazing what they do with getting young people involved and everything else. And yet, you know, they are going to be left scrambling here affecting their future. And I hope the housing project goes ahead, but I can not support it as it stands right now and I did not support it in the committee because I just felt that the curling club deserves great respect for everything they have done in our city, continue to do. In keeping a facility going, a rec facility, vibrant, centrally located, so all people from all parts of Winnipeg can potentially go and enjoy that facility and use it. And…but that will be made all the more harder with the loss of…a massive loss to their parking lot…their parking amenity and the amount of parking stalls that they are losing now. So, those are my comments, Madam Speaker. I really wish…again, I want to thank EPC for the amendment. I hope that that is done in cooperation with the club and coming back with a parking plan. But I hope it is also done well in advance of the construction on that parking lot which will see their parking completely removed from that site. And really, I think it is in our best interests to do that because from what I am hearing in the chamber on the earlier matters, is that they are…we are not sure what could happen with the HAF. And in the event the new party comes into power, and in the event it is Poilievre, I am not sure...

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: Extension?

Madam Speaker: Do you need one?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes.

Madam Speaker: One minute?

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, two minutes.

Madam Speaker: Two-minute extension, Councillor Schreyer moves. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: You know, in the event that…and I do not recall a federal government going back. I know that they can announce, you know, a stoppage of funds going forward. But for our federal government coming…future federal government coming in and then cancelling and nulling previous funding that was already been announced, very rare. I do not recall that happening. But they are saying that potentially that could happen with a new Federal Conservative government. But even having said that, if that is the case, we do know it is in our best interests to work with the curling club to avoid them filing an appeal to the Municipal Board which, therefore, could take months and impact the funding if in the event that it is true in terms of what a future conservative government would do with this funding. So, either way, not knowing that, it is in our best interests to work with them to find a resolution to it and I was happy to see that amendment moved at the Executive Policy Committee. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stand and will be calling for a recorded vote to signal to the community that, yes, Council is serious about housing. I do appreciate the work of Executive Policy Committee. I do not appreciate the work that came out of P and D because here is why, and it is in the report, Madam Speaker. On Council directions to the Public Service that this aligns with, i.e. Complete Communities, Directions Strategy 2.0., general growth, setting an intensification target, Madam Speaker, that is 2.1 of Communities Direction. 2.2 is aiming to establish a minimum of 350 new dwelling units per year in the downtown. Something I appreciate as a local councillor, one of three for the downtown. Goal two: reinforcing downtown as the primary focus, Madam Speaker. Facilitating the redevelopment of vacant or under-

utilized properties, such as surface parking lots, Madam Speaker. I remember voting on that. I remember voting on that last term to support increased residential and mixed-use development when servicing allows to achieve sustainable, inclusive and a vibrant downtown. Goal number four: ensuring land use decisions reduce the impact of automobile use and enhance the pedestrian experience. Strategic surface parking, Madam Speaker, 4.1 – reducing the number of surface parking lots in the downtown and discouraging the creation expansion of stand-alone surface parking lots. Centre plan, Madam Speaker, another policy I voted on, and as did many of my fellow councillors. Wanting to explore the feasibility of redeveloping surface parking next to the Granite Curling Club to include both market and nonmarket housing that supports club operations and/or building maintenance. I could go on, Madam Speaker, of the many policy goals that this supports. But in the main, it is…it is the opportunity to build affordable and deeply affordable units that was at issue when Council voted, practically unanimously, save for one, to move a variety of properties. And we have another on the agenda today. But Madam Speaker, time is of the essence when we moved that property out the door. And know what I am particularly proud of is the design that the City of Winnipeg bought when they engaged UWCRC, a not-for-profit, Madam Speaker, and here is why. A very best practice, of course, if you…if you can not make it fast, right. But a very best practice when moving housing out the door is to replicate a design you know that works. And on Colony is the building that will, I pray, stand in the Granite. On Colony right now, housing people is the exact model that we are engaged in building. And no short of former Mayor Don Iveson, the patriot saint of housing in Canada, the Federation of Canada Municipalities guru who helped the federal government see the light that moving housing dollar to cities like ours is…can help with a solution and help house people, Madam Speaker. And he along with Lisa Raitt have identified replicating buildings. The intent here is to replicate that building right on that site. That, Madam Speaker, is a best practice. And that, when I was Chair of housing, was on my list to complete. So, holy cow, I hope it is unanimous today. I hope that everyone has fidelity that their vote that moved all these properties out, when? In the summer, Madam Speaker. And then directed the Public Service to do what? Create housing, Madam Speaker. And if you are concerned about the Granite, boy, do I have good news. At the same time I was meeting with them and said, curlers are housing advocates, too. And I think many of you got those e-mails that really underlined that that was true. What you do not know is I was working with the Granite as local councillor to do what? To absolutely safeguard the…their parking. Why? Because portions of the board, not the portions that came to you to complain about this housing project to, you know, maybe decide that they might be housing entrepreneurs, maybe decide that they want 1.2 million in a PowerPoint doc that they had given me. It was…it was sucking and blowing, Madam Speaker. But portions of their board were trying to draw down the Everest Curling Championship. And I think there is good news coming that this is going to be a sporting season. So, Madam Speaker, sometimes both things are true. Sometimes a board or a council has voices from opposing sides and one piece of the board is drawing down work. Absolutely, if you draw down a national event like the Everest Curling Championship, guess what you are doing? You have got not only beds and heads, but you have a parking plan, Madam Speaker. And that is something that I committed to working them with. So, if you are worried, do not worry. And I will absolutely invite every member of Council to, you know, come celebrate that curling championship when we draw it down. But what I really want, though, is for every member of Council to really get behind what we said we were going to do not so many months ago in providing City land for City housing and you will all be proud that we are also crushing some other goals like replicating a design. That speeds things up because it is ready made. And that is what this is, Madam Speaker. So, I really hope that without, you know, more ad homonym attacks to our Public Service, or the designer, in this case, that we can get this done. I am alert to the sensitivities as the local councillor, I really am. I supported them when they wanted to move the Beer Can onto, what? Their parking lot. Why? To get some revenue. That is not…that is not going anywhere either. So, you know, leave it to the local councillor. That is what I did when I was Chair of Property and Development and I spoke to, Madam Speaker, both Councillor Wyatt who did not want a property on for affordable housing and Councillor Schreyer who had questions and other councillors that may have questions. We have another one here. And I just asked Council that if you are serious, please understand that the City is then going to go and do what we said, move it out for affordable housing. We vote on another piece of property today. But Madam Speaker, time is of the essence, as the Mayor said on some of this. That is actually true. So, we need a unanimous vote because money and housing units are at stake. So, please let it be unanimous. I call for a unanimous vote.

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

Councillor Mayes: As I was waiting several hours to speak very briefly about the Canoe Club item, at…when I was the first in line to be a delegate. But first we had to do the eight-hour hearing. There was a discussion at that point, eight or nine hours in of the…10 hours, thank you. I am corrected by Councillor Duncan who was there. In any event, you know, a couple of words in praise for Councillor Duncan. He had put forward the amendment that did not succeed at committee. It did succeed at EPC. It is paragraph number four; try and work out a parking plan. So, I have heard from all sides on this issue, including people who are curlers at the Granite who favoured doing some housing, which I thought was kind of courageous stance for some of those folks to take and to get in touch with me. So, I do want to…a few words in praise of Councillor Duncan for coming up with that idea of let's at least try and work out a parking plan and that will hopefully address some of the concerns. But I am…with those comments, I will be supporting the recommendation made by EPC.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A few things to say. This came to the Standing Committee of Property Planning and Development, of which I am a member. We deliberated for a long time. There was a lot to discuss. We have a conflict of priorities here for our city on this one. One is affordable housing. To me, if I am going to be serious about affordable housing, as serious as we have been in this province in the past, the statistics are there to tell us. We are not talking about deeply affordable housing. We are talking…we are talking, essentially, about taking the edge off. And it is going to be temporary. Madam Speaker, I have been predicting, I have been talking about inflation for a long time. We have not been serious in this Council about explaining to the public, to the taxpayers, to our citizens what is going to happen, how it is getting worse and why. We do not talk about that. And if we do not talk about it, whose job is it to talk about it? Meanwhile, we are taxing people to subsidize…to subsidize the cost of housing. We are not dealing with the cost of housing. We are not explaining it and we are not trying to solve it, we are just trying to take the edge off temporarily by de-regulating, taking the power away from councillors to make housing a little cheaper for a while. That is all I know, and that is all we know, unless you can read the future. But I have been making…made predictions on this kind of stuff, Madam Speaker, that have come true because it is kind of simple math in some extents. One, you have to accept the fact we are not doing anything about housing inflation. Therefore, we subsidize it for a little while. Two, we know that it is only going to get worse at this rate. Three, this is not nearly as affordable as it used to be. And if you are serious about housing, you should be able to say that to everybody every day if you care about housing and affordable housing and deeply affordable housing. Madam Speaker, we are not doing what we used to be able to do. Why not? That is the question we have to ask if we care about housing, including into the future. Affordable housing. It is getting worse and worse for everybody and this is going to take an edge off for a few people for a little while. That is all we know. In the meantime, Madam Speaker, we have a conflict of interest of our own City Hall because we believe in economic development. We even have an Economic Development Winnipeg. We have this thing called Tourism Winnipeg which tries to help us with our economic development. Because, as we all know, you can not…you have to have an economic driver to your social services. And tourism is an economic driver. Now, it happens to be, Madam Speaker, we all know, Winnipeg is not the greatest tourism destination. But we do know something. We know curling is primarily a Canadian sport. It is an international sport, but we kind of dominate it. Happens to be traditionally a western Canadian sport, starting at Lake Superior. It is a western Canadian sport. Starting from Thunder Bay, essentially, to Banff, kind of thing. That is…that is the heart of international curling. Some say Thunder Bay is the capital of curling, but do they have as many curling rinks as we do? No, they do not. So, essentially, Winnipeg is the curling capital of the world.

Councillor Duncan: Item No. 8 – Subdivision and Rezoning of 22 Granite Way. Yeah, I am not sure where the councillor is going with this.

Madam Speaker: I did…I did hear curling so we will continue...

Councillor Duncan: …Subdivision and rezoning…Subdivision and rezoning.

Councillor Schreyer: Yeah, this is…this is my problem, Madam Speaker...

Councillor Duncan: We talked about it for 10 hours. And through those 10 hours, it was repeated multiple times, this is a subdivision and rezoning, not a look back in history about what happened with curling in Canada. Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: No, Madam Speaker, I am talking about the future. If Winnipeg is the curling capital, we are talking about tourism. And tourism is economic development. And who are we to deny that we are not a great tourism capital? But when we are…when we are the capital of a sport, I think we should recognize that…

Madam Speaker: …Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Your point has been made. Anything more on the subdivision and rezoning…

Councillor Schreyer:…Fair enough, Madam Speaker. We are…we are putting in jeopardy what could be the most…because this is…Madam Speaker, we have to understand the zoning here we are talking about. We are talking about the Granite Curling Club, which is the oldest curling club in western Canada in the capital…in the curling capital of the world, in Winnipeg. And it is in the middle of the city, right next to the legislature, right next to Osborne Village. Walking distance from The Forks and from Portage Avenue. And the reality is, Madam…Madam…we are not in a position to disregard when we have a tourism advantage, when we happen to be the capital of a world sport. And Madam Speaker, given this one, in the middle of a city that is still existing, the oldest one in western Canada, already given a historical designation. Not my opinion. It already has an official historical designation. When we forego the ability to…for people to go to the Granite Curling Club, I am saying it might be the most important curling club in the world. And as if we are in a position to just forget about that. Tourism in Winnipeg does not mean anything. We can forgo that. We have got so much tourism going on, we can just forget about the fact that this is a tourism destination. And we could do more. We can do better by promoting Winnipeg tourism. By promoting The Forks, skating in the wintertime, but forgoing at the other end by Osborne village where the skating ends? The fact that this is, arguably, the most important curling club in the world. And

say, we do not need tourism in Winnipeg? Well, tourism, Madam Speaker, and economic development is what feeds our ability to pay for what we want, such as our goals for affordable housing, Madam Speaker. So, at this point, I know the meeting was important because from that we got, at least to some people's satisfaction, this new motion saying that the…prior to the issuance of the development permit, the Public Service be directed to work with the proponent of the Granit Curling Club to develop an adequate parking plan in order to support the operational sustainability of the club to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works and the Director of Planning, Property and Development. Madam Speaker, that is all very well. And I know why we did that, it was because of the pressure put on…that we put on at the meeting. So, the meeting resonated. The thing is, Madam Speaker, you would have thought what we just said would have already happened. They already had a parking plan. So, now they are going to go ahead and have a better parking plan. I hope that was the point of that meeting, Madam Speaker. Not to jeopardize the future tourism of the city, as if we can afford to do that, Madam Speaker. And to say it is at the cost of affordable housing, I have been saying that for 10 years. Now we are putting our economic development, which is what makes us able to pay for affordable housing, to subsidize affordable housing. Putting that in jeopardy madam…Madam Speaker. We are talking about the long-term future of a sport that is not going away. You know what, on Valentine's Day, my son and I visited the Granite Curling Club, and most of the curlers were under 30. It was a wonderful thing to see. We are talking about the future, Madam Speaker. We are talking about economic development. And why would we deny that? Why would we deny that of ourselves? Why do we pay tribute to Economic Development Winnipeg and Tourism Winnipeg, Manitoba...

Madam Speaker: …Okay, Councillor Schreyer.

Mayor Gillingham: We are talking about the subdivision and the rezoning.

Councillor Schreyer: Such as Councillor Rollins' speech? I think my speech is very parallel.

Madam Speaker: It is related, but you have made your point. Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Mine is about sacrificing the ability to pay for housing. And who are we to do that? How come you can talk about housing but you can not talk about economic development and sacrificing economic development in the city, Madam Speaker? Well, I always talk about housing. I talk about the unaffordable…unaffordability of food, housing and our taxes every meeting.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schryer, thank you. The two were related. Appreciate your comments, thank you. Moving on to the next speaker. Councillor Duncan on the subdivision and rezoning.

Councillor Duncan: I would love to. So, subdivision rezoning, this is…for those of you that are cheering on at home, this is a parking lot that is beside the Granite Curling Club. A great opportunity. I won't get into great detail. Councillor Rollins, the area councillor, the former Chair, explained it perfectly. We are going to develop a parking lot, hopefully. We do not know what is going on there. A group came forward and said, here is the possibility to have affordable and deeply affordable housing on that lot. So, the question before us today, Madam Speaker, is does the Council want affordable and deeply affordable units or not? And with that, you know, we heard from delegation after delegation after delegation. 10 hours worth, believe it or not. And we came up with bullet point number four, that prior to the issuance of a development permit, the Public Service will be directed to work with the proponent and the Granite Curling Club to develop an adequate parking plan in order to support the operational sustainability of the club to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works and the Director of Property, Planning and Development. Everyone around the table, including all the public servants, said that it is the utmost importance to maintain sustainability of the Granite Curling Club. Apparently, it is a hotbed for economic development now, that is great news. So, it is going to keep going in the future. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Schreyer: I will be glad to. Absolutely.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Let's respect others' speaking time everyone. Next speaker? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In closing, I will just maybe hit a couple of highlights. I thought, yes, Councillor Rollins did an excellent job of explaining what this is. I completely support the way she has explained it. And Councillor Duncan, as well. I want to thank both of them for the way they have articulated what this is and the opportunity that is before us. It is also a reminder within…tucked within this report…what this is about, this is not a vote about parking, this is a vote about housing. Much needed housing. And that is what the subdivision and rezoning will permit. And I also take us to the report here. In the background section of the report, it talks about the fact that out of the Housing Accelerator Fund, one of the things that…key actions we committed to, was the creation of a land enhancement office. I want to take a moment just to acknowledge and…the good work of the land enhancement office team that is pulling together…identifying and pulling together lands that could be made available for housing. And whether it is that marker,

affordable, deeply affordable, even rent geared to income. So, I want to just acknowledge their very hard work that they are doing and the good work they are doing. As someone had mentioned, coming up pretty soon, we have got another report we are going to be voting on related to Pacific Avenue, a piece of property on Pacific Avenue. In that report, you will see seven pieces of property that have been identified that we voted on previously. All that to say, this is some of the work done, funded by the Housing Accelerator Fund, that is providing for us in this city what is most needed at this moment. And that is housing. And so, again, with thanks to all involved in getting this report prepared, I ask that we vote…I ask for a unanimous vote in favour of what is before us. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour of Item 8? Call for a recorded vote. Please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Schreyer and Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 2.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Item 8…Item 8 passes. Okay, next, we have a...yes?

Councillor Schreyer: Point of information, Madam Speaker. Since I was interrupted while talking with this, I want to make the point that when I do see that has…has been some compromise and some allowance for the fact that we need to sustain this place, which may be the case, and I take credit for that from the meeting, I will gladly support the result of that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, sorry, could you...

Councillor Schreyer: …Well, we do not know what the result is yet. We say that it is going to be to the satisfaction of the director. We already did that. When I see the result, if it is good, then I will support it.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. I do not believe there will be another vote on that, but thank you for the comment. We have a notice of motion under this committee. Motion 2, which is moved by the Mayor and seconded by Councillor Eadie. This a notice of motion and it is regarding our Welcoming Winnipeg policy. The motion will be debated at next month's Council meeting, and there is a lot of detail here, so please take the time to review it. It is important. Okay, we will move on to by-laws. Oh, we have more motions, yes. Motion 6, that is been moved by Councillor…Mayor Gillingham, seconded by Councillor Wyatt. It is regarding the gas tax funds and the needs for…the need for increase in gas tax funds. That will be automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Next is Motion 7. It is moved by Councillor Mayers, seconded by Councillor Wyatt. Yes?

Councillor Chambers: With Motion 3 and Motion 6, is Motion 3 still valid? It was withdrawn? Okay.

Madam Speaker: Yes, that was rescinded earlier. Thank you. Motion 7: moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Wyatt, regarding the housing accelerator four-plex and four-stories debate. This is a notice of motion. Will be next month's Council agenda for debate. Thank you. Okay. Any others, Mr. Clerk? Not at this time. Thank you. Move in to by-laws for first reading only. Mr. Mayor.

Motion No. 2
Moved by His Worship Mayor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS Council adopted the Welcoming Winnipeg: Reconciling our History policy on January 30, 2020, an important initiative to ensure Indigenous histories and personages, as the original peoples of Canada, are included in Winnipeg's place names;

AND WHEREAS aspects of the Welcoming Winnipeg initiative have been identified in the past as needing improvement and the five-year mark of the policy's adoption is an opportune moment to amend the policy;

AND WHEREAS Merrell-Ann Phare, B.A., LL.B., L.L.M., of Phare Law Corporation, was commissioned by Mayor Gillingham to ascertain how the policy could be refined;

AND WHEREAS policy feedback was received from Council, Indigenous Relations Division, the Committee of Community Members, the Office of the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Officer as part of that work;

AND WHEREAS the resulting Welcoming Winnipeg Policy: Thematic Interview Report is a useful guiding document that identifies key policy areas requiring attention, foremost among them the need for policy clarity;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. *The Public Service be directed to:*

    A. *Report back to Council in 120 days on changes to the current Welcoming Winnipeg Policy based on suggestions outlined in the Thematic Interview Report, attached as Appendix A, including the following:*

        i. *Funding implications of specific actions and policies that may require additional resources;*

        ii. *clarification that the policy affords equitable opportunity to all communities and groups, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, for park and place renamings;*

        iii. *a review of existing policies that may overlap with the Welcoming Winnipeg policy;*

        iv. *Committee of Community Members' terms of reference.*

    B. *Enter into a single-source contract with Merrell-Ann Phare, author of the Welcoming Winnipeg Policy: Thematic Interview Report, for consulting services to provide guidance on the implementation of the report's recommendations, to be funded by the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.*

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

Motion No. 6
Moved by His Worship Mayor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS the Municipal Canada Community-Building Fund (formerly known as the Gas Tax Fund), in real dollars, has been dropping in value due to construction inflation that is above, typically, the 2% for inflation, now budgeted for in the existing program;

AND WHEREAS construction inflation has consistently exceeded the inflation rate commonly referred to at 2%;

AND WHEREAS the Municipal Canada Community-Building Fund is used to fund infrastructure projects that have experienced inflation cost pressures annually that have been consistently above 2% inflation.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that City Council call on the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) and the Association of Manitoba Municipalities (AMM) to lobby the Federal Government for the purpose of negotiating an annual indexing rate that reflects the actual national average, of any given year, of the construction inflation increase in construction infrastructure projects, for any renewed Municipal Canada Community-Building Fund, and that indexing shall be directly linked to the national average construction inflation increase.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the above be forwarded to both the FCM and AMM to be considered as a Policy Resolution at their respective conventions.

Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

WHEREAS the city is preparing the largest rezoning in its history with the coming debate over the "4plex and 4 storeys" aspect of the Housing Accelerator Fund;

AND WHEREAS the proposed changes will rezone all areas of the city, except for those covered in the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 100/2004;

AND WHEREAS the proposed changes include amendments to 21 local area plans, none of which are located downtown;

AND WHEREAS the public service is planning to hold a single in-person public information session on March 19, 2025 to hear from City of Winnipeg residents, and that one meeting is to be held in the downtown;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the public service be directed to hold in-person public consultations between April 2 and May 10, 2025 in each of the 15 Council Wards to solicit feedback on the proposed zoning changes.*

2. *That the public consultation dates, times and locations be provided to the public at least five working days in advance of the information sessions, with advertising at a minimum to be purchased on Facebook.*

3. *That the Chief Administrative Officer be directed to cover any security-related costs (e.g. provision of security guards).*

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

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 18/2025 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 18/2025.

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

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a second time: By-law No. 126/2022, By-law No. 89/2023, By-law No. 73/2024, By-law No. 18/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 126/2022, By-law No. 89/2023, By-law No. 73/2024, By-law No. 118/2024.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, next section.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that By-law Nos. 126/2022, 89/2023, 73/2024, 118/2024 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS

Mayor Gillingham: Okay, I move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 15/2025, By-law No. 16/2025, By-law No. 23/2025, By-law No. 24/2025.

Madam Speaker: All in favour?

Councillor Wyatt: 16/2025.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Contrary? That is carried. Noted Councillor Wyatt in opposition of 16.

Clerk: By-law No. 15/2025, By-law No. 16/2025, By-law No. 23/2025, By-law No. 24/2025.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that By-law Nos. 15/2025, 16/2025, 23/2025, and 20…24/2025 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour?

Councillor Wyatt: Item…By-law No. 16/2025.

Madam Speaker: Contrary? That is carried. We note Councillor Wyatt's opposition of one of them, 16.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 15/2025, 16/2025, 23/2025, 24/2025.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the rules be…the rule be suspended and By-law Nos. 15/2025, 16/2025, 23/2025, and 24/2025 be read third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And that is noted for you, Councillor Wyatt. We will now move on to question period. Councillor Mayes, question period for the Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I was pleased to hear the Mayor remind Councillor Wyatt that there is a provincial requirement to be done on the biosolids. I would, however, ask as we head into the debate about water and sewer rates, as we head into the accompanying debate about the water and sewer dividend that we have been taking…noting that we have had the highest property tax increase in some decades. So, not everything is about affordability. We have been able to come up with the property tax increase greater than what we have had before, but my question then is, acknowledging that the Province…these requirements to do biosolids…the Mayor would also be aware, I take it, that the City of Winnipeg shall implement the CSO Masterplan for control option number one by December 31st, 2045. Is the written instruction the requirement from the provincial government pursuant to the environment tax? So, just as we have a requirement to do the biosolids, we also have a requirement to get the billion-dollar CSO work done by December 31st, 2045.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I thank the Councillor for his question. I certainly…I do acknowledge that. I appreciate him pointing that out again.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: As one drifts through the CSO documents, one comes across a number of things including…the City was to have done its first five-year water quality report by December 31st, 2024. I am advised by Mr. Shanks, who is remarkably good at returning calls and emails, Mr. Shanks says that report is done it is just…has not been made available to Council or the public. Could the Mayor undertake to, at the earliest convenience, have the civil service disclose to the Council and/or…well, the Council and the public, the first water quality report, five-year report, that was duly submitted as per the deadline of December 31st, 2024? It was the river…river water quality report, I should clarify.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I thank the Councillor for the question and thank you for clarifying river quality report. I will certainly work with Councillor Eadie, the Chair of the committee, to see where that is at. I have not seen that report but will certainly look into it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: The Mayor and his staff have…or, have indicated in the media that the public will have roughly 75 to 77 days for input on the fourplex plan once it is presented on March 19th…March 17th actually. That gets you to the days…that only gets you to the days, if indeed the hearing is in early June. Certainly, there has been some movement by City staff and at least one member of EPC to try and move that earlier, which would mean we would not have the 77 days for public input. Can the Mayor reassure us that the efforts are being made to actually schedule the week or more long hearing on fourplexes and four-stories, that that is being scheduled for early June in order to live up to the idea that there will be a 75, 77-day period for input after this document is made public in mid-March.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. Madam Speaker, yes. Council made a decision, voted to move that hearing to the June timeline. There has been no change, there has been no motion to move it back or move it up from that June timeline. The discussion that I have overheard, or…in general, has been that staff is working to schedule the hearing in accordance with that Council direction. And yes, there will be at least 75 to 77 days between what our staff is proposing will be the timeline, if they kind of release the information, and invite the members of the public to provide feedback, get their questions answered. And so 77 days I think is in a good amount of time that information can certainly flow back and forth before the hearing, which is still set for June.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, Madam Speaker, can the Mayor tell us, it has been a couple of months now since we heard that we did have somebody chosen for the Chief of Police. Now it is been a couple of months. We still have not heard. We are still in lingo on what is going on with the Chief of Police, and can the Mayor provide us some updates on that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. That…that information is for the Police Board to ultimately respond to and reveal. I think we do know because we have said this before, it has been quite public that the Police Board has, you know, I have just reiterated what the Chair has said before, and we know the Police Board has gone through, is going through a process to hire the next Chief of Police. In that process, the Board is taking things very, very seriously to make sure all is done accordingly, and that the process is thorough. And when the Police Board is ultimately ready to make an announcement, the Board will make an announcement led by our Chair, Councillor Markus Chambers.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes. Would the Mayor commit on providing us a seminar on this issue? I think it is really important that we, as councillors, are hearing what's going on. I do think that we are owed some explanations on some things here. It is not just about an HR matter. We have had lots of issues in the past, Madam Speaker, where we have had seminars that had to deal with HR matters. But I think that citizens of Winnipeg, the councillors should be aware of what's going on with the hiring of our Chief of Police, and I think it is just an update and there is some information that, you know, that maybe the Mayor and…does not want to share, but there is…

Madam Speaker: …Thank you. The question's been asked. Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Yeah, first and foremost, as I said, when the Police Board I think is ready to make an announcement or has an announcement to make, the Board will make that announcement. I think at that time, if there is other questions that councillors have, they could direct them to our chair, Councillor Chambers, for information. I am not recalling, maybe there is, I am not recalling a time in my 10 years where, in the midst of or during a hiring process, there was a Council seminar. There is an…there is an HR process. It is the hiring process, like I said, when the Board is ready to make an announcement, they will make the announcement. If there is follow-up questions any Councillor has, then I am…they can be directed to Councillor Chambers at that time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker. I rise…just a concern about the City finance because Councillor Browaty is not here today, so I want to direct my question through the Mayor. We now know the latest aspect on the Chief Peguis Trail extension, is now as high as…over 900 million dollars, including the interest charges, minus the 600 million approximately, we are getting it from the federal, provincial governments on the treatment plant, we are up to 2.2 billion there. Knowing the future costs of the widening of Kenaston Boulevard, the new Arlington Bridge, the south end RecPlex, the East of the Red RecPlex, not to mention other capital projects that we have, or others that have been deferred, like Louise Bridge, is there any planning outside of the traditional budget process, which tends to leave things without much policy thought in terms of looking at other options, is there any planning initiative under where are being contemplated to better position the City with options to fund these various projects in light of the escalating construction costs and the reliance that we seem to be growing on in terms of financing projects through debt alone?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I want to thank the Councillor for the question. Yeah, first of all, the report that will come to the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works, Councillor Lukes' committee that will be discussing, debating and ultimately make its way to Council, does show the updated cost of the Chief Peguis Trail extension. And Councillor is right. It is over 700 million with…and then if you add in the debt servicing cost with that…that is if the City were to go it alone. There was never…I do not think any intentions…not my intention, that the City would be in position to ever go it alone, because the case within that report shows that there is a benefit, and that benefit certainly to the City of Winnipeg over…I know it is not before us, but I will answer the question. And that benefit to the City of Winnipeg over 75 years, but the federal provincial governments stand to significantly benefit as well. All that to say, to move that project ahead would require federal provincial participation, how it is financed, whether it is a P3 model or some other model, I am…you know, when we get to that point, I am very open to, as one…you know, one member of Council and the Mayor, open to looking at options to do this project and frankly other projects as well. And so, I thank the Councillor for his question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I rise…and the reason I ask the question is because I realized that there is provincial federal, and I thank the Mayor for his response to mine, and enlighten the Council chamber that we hopefully will get funding for those projects from those…the other key levels of government. Yes, the challenge we are going to have going forward is just our ability…and not to mention the existing infrastructure that we also have to deal with, that we do have funding for, thanks to the one-on-one with the local street renewal and the regional street renewal. But even that, as I said earlier, we are falling behind the 8-ball on that one. Has there been any thought to what Councils used to do in the past, which was rather than kicking the ball down the road, what they would do, for example, and I will give you an example just quickly, was when Council knew that it had to build a water treatment facility because of changing legislation in regards to drinking water, which is built in the RM of Springfield, councils in the past would set aside…create a reserve fund, and the reserve fund would be where monies starting now, in property tax increases typically, because that is what we are relying on, would be earmarked towards setting aside and seeding the reserve fund that would then be used to reduce the reliance on debt and borrowing, which was a big concern of previous councils because of Council going in debt so much in the past, especially in the '70s and the '80s, and then the interest rates being what they were then. Has there been any thought to bringing that practice back? Because that is something we have not done for some time, and it would allow us to be proactive in setting aside funds for projects that Council intends to support and build which I think majority of councillors intend to support, as I do, Chief Peguis and Kenaston widening and the other projects…

Madam Speaker: …Thank you, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Just a thought. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank the Councillor for the question and, in fact, the suggestion. Yes, as we bring these projects forward and we vote on these items, you know, the Chief Peguis Trail extension really with the recommendation there is to send the staff back to do a value for money analysis, but once we get to the point or as we are getting to the point of how we are prioritizing these infrastructure projects, yes, we have to think prudently about how we can pay for them. And so, whether it is a few mechanisms, whether it is something like a reserve, utilizing a P3 model with a reserve, like, however we want to, you know, do this, we have to give good thought to how we would pay for and afford these projects. I do want to recognize today that I think Councillor Wyatt was, you know, very involved with the establishment of the local and regional street reserves over years ago. Many years ago, when he was Chair of Finance, right. And we are still utilizing that structure, it has been very successful and we have done…I think this year we are coming up on record budget, again, for 2025. So, there are some mechanisms that we can look at, maybe older mechanisms…or mechanisms that have been used in the past, that we can maybe consider again. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Final question is to give another suggestion or thought, in terms of financing or funding, and it could be a reserve fund for a new strategic infrastructure, not specifying one project in particular that you would start setting aside money for. This is on the last question. But under…as it stands right now south of the border, the Americans are able to issue municipal bonds. There is a requirement under the Canadian Charter Banking Act that needs to be changed to allow municipalities to issue bonds. It can be done as a pilot project. What better place than Winnipeg? It is far better for us, in my opinion, to borrow money on be…from citizens where we are paying them interest, rather than banks that are based out of Toronto. Has the Mayor given any thought to approaching the federal government to amend the Charter Banking Act to allow for municipal bonds? Which would allow us to keep money locally here in the economy, borrowing from local residents, paying them back with interest, keeping the economy…money in the economy locally, and giving residents an opportunity to actually save, while at the same time, rebuilding and building our city.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Yeah, I want to thank the Councillor for his question. I had a discussion, when I was Chair of Finance, with our treasury and others about the concept of municipal bonds and how they can work or not work, and the requirements, it is fairly onerous requirements on the City of Winnipeg, if we can deal with the municipal bond that…of the nature that the Councillor is talking about. It is not a dead no, but I would have to…we would have to do further look, I think, whether that is even feasible. It was interesting, as I mentioned in my opening comments today in my announcements, that I had the privilege on behalf of the Cities of Canada to be in Phoenix and to listen to the mayors there talk about their structure, which is a little bit different, where they will put, you know, on a ballot, a referendum on a bond for, you know, a new…a new sporting arena or some big thing. So, we do not do that. We do not have that structure at this point. So, but…as we look ahead, I think the bigger point I would say just to, you know, to the Councillor, to all of Council, as we look ahead at all of our infrastructure needs and our significant seven billion-dollar infrastructure deficit, it may and should require us to think a little bit differently, and be open to other ways by which we can work on financing and partnering and at paying for the significant needs that we have as a city. That really at the end of the day, what it is about, it is about service delivery to the citizens of Winnipeg, and it is about trying to make sure that the services they depend upon and the infrastructure that is required for our growing city is able to be funded in such a way that is thoughtful and prudent and moves us ahead without it being too, too onerous on one generation of payers.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since our Mayor and I have been elected about 10 years ago, and even starting before then. We have raised every tax, fine, fee, levy and rate, we have reduced services, we have spent our reserves, and we have gone further into debt, just the City of Winnipeg alone. A few Council meetings ago, His Worship stated that the reason for our budget increases for tax increases was due to COVID and labour costs and other factors. Realized later, he was…when he talked about labour costs, that included salaries as well. I would like to ask His Worship, where he got his statistics from.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, and we can restate the question. Councillor Schreyer, please.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, His Worship said that the reason for our budget increases or tax increases was due to COVID and labour costs and other factors, and I would like to know where he got his statistics. I think there would be more to that, I would talk about that. But, to start, I would like to know where he got his statistics.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I do not have at my fingertips the sources for that. I think it is generally understood when you look that the reporting our own staff does, whether it is…whether it is our treasury, whether it is…you know, our Chief Financial Officers, past and present, whether it is Statistics Canada, whether it is Chambers of Commerce, I mean, there is a myriad of reports that I think the Councillor frankly could just Google, and would see that across Canada, every city, every municipality is facing the same pressures. The costs are going up for a variety of reasons on the services we deliver, on the infrastructure we are building, and that is putting pressure on city budgets.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have been Googling that for…

Madam Speaker: …Thank you, second question.

Councillor Schreyer: Yeah, I have been Googling that for years. I have those statistics. It is just that I do not come to the same conclusions as that: COVID, labour costs, and other factors. To me, other factors is the greatest rate of inflation. Could he elaborate on that, since he has been getting all these reports?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I…first of all, I do not get reports that the rest of Council does not get, right? So, the information that we vote upon and decide upon are…is the information that is provided when it comes to…when it comes to our Standing Policy Committee on Finance, when they are dealing with every project by project, that we take a look at the threshold at which projects are reported, and if you look back at those project reports consistently, you will see that costs have risen, and our staff will say why the costs have risen. And so, I think in my comments as the Councillor has indicated, I apparently said, “and other reasons.” I say, “other reasons”, as a broad category to, you know, provide for any other reason the costs would be going up to the City.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question…then onto Councillor Wyatt...

Councillor Schreyer: …Yeah, Madam Speaker. To me, construction costs are the greatest inflation at City Hall. And that was not mentioned specifically. But he did mention a couple of Council meetings ago that he believes there was a construction inflation report that came out. Can we find that construction inflation report somewhere?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I am almost speechless. The construction inflation report was developed, put into a budget in previous years specifically because the Councillor from Elmwood asked for it. It is a report that has been provided, it is on DMIS, it is somewhere previously. So, I will gladly help the Councillor find that report that he called for and was delivered to him previously.

Madam Speaker: Very good. Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker. I rise…I want to thank the Mayor and ask a question on the lines of what has been happening for his leadership with regards to the issues south of the border. We have heard now that the new president has indicated a 10 percent surcharge on oil, exports, as well as…could be as soon as next week, the 25 percent tariff on Canadian-made products. There is a lot of concern that that would trigger a recession. I see all these wonderful young people in our gallery who have never experienced a recession. I remember I was their age when it did hit the early ‘90s, I am dating myself, but it was a recession in the early ‘90s that lasted four or five years here in Manitoba with unemployment rates, especially amongst youth, which were one of the highest in the country. But Manitoba also responded with regards to job program like we did in the 1980s. In light of what is possibly coming down the pipe, I have a number of questions, but the first one is this. Is it possible that between now and the next week, that the mayors especially of the big cities, could be getting together in terms of pushing the federal government for an independent and, this is the other great thing that we have seen in the Globe and Mail and other newspapers, for the first time the country is kind of waking up in the sense that an independent industrial strategy, an independent trades strategy outside of being so reliant on our trade with the Americans, to move our economy as fast as we can and diversify both our trading partners, but also prepare for a potential recession that could bite deep and affect working people dramatically here in Winnipeg, but also across the country. Is there any discussion and can you elaborate on what the work done…he has done thus far? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank the Councillor for the question. First of all, I want to thank all of Council because all of Council was…has been and is very interested in the impact of tariffs and counter-tariffs locally.

I thank our staff, I mentioned it before, they provided a council seminar, the good work of our CAO and our Interim Deputy CAO, Matt Dryburgh and his team. We had kind of stakeholders also provide information as to what the impacts could be locally on specific sectors, whether it is advanced manufacturing or agriculture or aerospace or others, and then specifically the impact that could…within the City of Winnipeg. If indeed there is going to be tariffs and counter-tariffs on vehicles, and every time they cross the border in production, three, four, five…three or four times, the price is going to go up. What does that do to our fleet costs? What will it do to, you know, any chemicals we need to procure for our water and sewer treatment plants? So, our staff is looking at all that. That has been the request of Council and I thank them for that. I think it was Councillor Orlikow who had a great idea; I think that at the next Standing Policy Committee on Finance, a motion will come forward to have our staff report on these impacts on a regular basis. So, we are trying to take care of what is happening locally and do all we can to mitigate any impacts with the limited resources…not resources, the limited position and opportunity we have here. Of course, the federal provincial governments are more so on the policy setting, you know, global or…global…national policy setting agenda that will impact to…and perhaps help mitigate the impact of tariffs and counter-tariffs. One of the things that we have been calling for as a Council, but certainly the mayors of Canada have been calling for a reduction, elimination of the interprovincial trade barriers, so that, you know, if you are making a product here in Manitoba, which by the way, Manitoba has done, of all the provinces, kind of one of the best jobs of reducing interprovincial trade barriers, but finding ways to allow Canadian producers to access markets in other provinces, if we cannot rely upon the market south of the border to the degree that we did. And also, to your point, we are calling upon provinces and the federal government especially to do all it can to help identify markets outside of Canada for our manufacturers, producers, ag-producers, whatever the case would be, so that we have a place to sell…to sell our goods and to enter into a new trade relationships that are other sources. So, one of the things I know that, you know, we have…I have said, and big city mayors are saying is, we are standing with our provincial leaders. I want to acknowledge Premier Kinew and the work he is doing, really in the leadership role, across Canada with the other premiers to try to come to a unified approach on how to counter the tariffs and mitigate against their impacts and calling on federal governments as well to be really unified to do the very thing you are asking for, Councillor, is to look at ways that we could open up new markets and mitigate the impact because what this is about ultimately is this. It is about jobs and paycheques in our city. The economies of our nation are centered in cities or flow through cities. There we have heard there will be an impact, no doubt, to sectors and jobs and businesses within the city of Winnipeg and it will impact, to a smaller extent, but it will impact the City of Winnipeg in tariffs and the retaliatory tariffs are put in place. And so, we need to be aware of that and I appreciate that this will be a standing item, a regular policy committee, on a go-forward basis here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: You know, and I thank the Mayor for his response. In the middle of my community is New Flyer Industries, 95 or 95 percent of their busses go for exports to the United States. You know, I could see a scenario where the plant is shut down, and everybody is laid off because of these tariffs that are coming down, and then we would have a massive hit potentially on our tax base as well, not to say the least in the event we lose industry. My concern is, is it possible via the FCM and via the federal government with their assistance and they are taking the lead on this matter, that the big city mayors, including yourself…Mister…President Trump is also an elected official, and if various mayors in Canada were supposed to start phoning mayors down in the States, many of them who are Republicans, and say, you know, you realize that this is going to be the impact on you, especially when we retaliate with our trade tariffs, and it could drive us both into recession. And then the President's phone starts ringing. Has any thought been given to that strategy to put pressure on mayors across the United States, especially those in the mid-west who are close to us here?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank the Councillor for the question. Now this is exactly why I was in Phoenix and that is exactly what we are doing in Phoenix, among other things…there was, as I said, of the mayors. Some of them were from Michigan. And so, I was able, in real time, to connect those, some Republican mayors, in Michigan who do not want tariffs because they know what it will do to the auto-sector. Right, they have been there before. They have experienced it. They know how, yes, in some ways, sometimes it creates more jobs, more jobs are lost than created in the U.S. when that happens. And those Republican mayors do not want tariffs and counter-tariffs. So, I was able to connect them with Mayor Drew Dilkens of Windsor, Ontario, one of Canada's mayors who is…who is doing all he can, he stood up this Border Mayors Alliance with FCM's help, with the support of FCM. So, you know, years…you know, I would say this again. If you know mayors in the United States, small cities, large cities, whatever the case would be, and you can call them or email them or text them and make the case and help them understand the impact of tariffs, that would be really, really helpful because, as I said, at the end of day, my comments and my presentation to the U.S mayors was that, tariffs and counter-tariffs ultimately…they are tax, that gets passed on to the consumer. It is going to hurt the citizens in your city. It is going to hurt the citizens of my city. It threatens jobs, it threatens paycheques. And so, yes, we should leverage every relationship we have. Big city mayors are leveraging every relationship we have. The Chair of the Big City Mayors' Caucus, Josh Morgan of London, was in Washington last month. I went to Phoenix. He is going back to Washington next month to try to make the case of all mayors, all councils, all cities, within Canada. One of the things that…has not been announced, but can not

be announced, I do not think right now because of the Transcona blackout, is the Premier has just invited me on behalf of all of us to sit on his U.S. Trade Council Committee. So, I will be, you know, be taking a seat there as well to try to keep us abreast of what is happening, and try to make our case for, you know, for countering these tariffs or potential tariffs. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question.

Councillor Wyatt: Last question is, I will keep it brief. Other cities, and I offer this off…more as, are you aware. So, as to give a suggestion that maybe will be helpful that under a previous mayor, toward the end of his term, Mayor Katz, he set aside…he realized the importance of economic development and decided to start taking a lead on that through his office. However, having said that, many cities, especially in the U.S., but also in Canada through their accommodation taxes, use it as a form to fund economic development office directly…often is led by the mayor who is kind of seen as the figure-head of the council. But it is a mechanism that would allow you versus the arm-length…We have Economic Development Winnipeg, and it is not that they do not do a great job, but in light of the political nature of this situation right now and the need to move quickly in terms of an independent industrial strategy, independent trade strategy, the interprovincial trade barriers the Mayor refers to. Maybe this is an opportunity to consider beefing an arm…creating an arm within the Mayor's office or close to it, that would allow us to address this issue and start to moving our economy in a new direction, in light of what has happened.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Yeah. Madam Speaker, appreciate the comments from the Councillor. I think, you know, what is clear is what we have…what we have focused on and I know I have prioritized and I thank Council for supporting this…these kind of initiatives. One of the priorities we had a few years ago was to put in the budget…stand-up a position called the Economic Development Officer. And Matt Dryburgh, before being, you know, into the Chair here as the Deputy Interim CAO, has been serving in that role, and that is really to help provide service to those looking to invest within…within our city, which is key.

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

Mayor Gillingham: …I will try to answer quickly here. Winnipeg needs a strong economy if we are ever going to be able to continue to provide the services our citizens rely upon, so we have to have a strong economy, there is no doubt about that. So, the Economic Development Officer. One of the things we fund is we funded the servicing of CentrePort, so we have industrial service lands available for those that invest. I can not stress enough that we need to continue to do all we can and then even look at the decisions we are making through the light of…whether or not we are investor-ready. We look at other cities and other jurisdictions and other municipalities and other regional capital regions who have a plan in place. I think Calgary just announced a significant regional economic development plan that makes them ready for investment. Edmonton has the same. We do not have it yet. We do not have it yet. We need it because we are going…other people are, as been saying was years ago, they are going to be eating our lunch, in other parts of the nation, if we are not serious about investor-readiness to allow businesses here, who maybe, you know, need to re-tool what they are doing so that they can really find new markets or find new ways to do things if the U.S. market dries up. We need to be prepared to provide investors and those looking to expand or grow or build, or hang on, the services that they need, so that we can continue to highlight or, pardon me, emphasize the building of our economy as well. So, appreciate the Councilor's questions on that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer, 30 seconds.

Councillor Schreyer: Yeah, we are talking about 25 percent tariffs which would be awful. Madam Speaker, we have already had a 25 percent increase in these costs in the last few years. And has the Mayor…would the Mayor like to comment on that or has the Mayor discussed the fact that in just the last four years alone, we have already had that 25 percent increase?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Yeah, no. As I said, and I think we have all said, costs have gone up significantly and we are grappling with and have to make decisions on how to continue to provide services in the City of Winnipeg and the citizens that rely upon them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Duncan.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED FEBRUARY 6, 2025**

Madam Speaker: Your inaugural report.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much. I believe number two. Number two. Number two. Thank you. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. With that, I would like to introduce the report of February 6th and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 through 5.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes? 4 – Golf Operations at the Canoe Club. Call the question on 1 to 3 and No. 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Two members not at their seats, it is noted. Thank you. Mister…Madam Clerk.

Item 4 – Golf Operations at Canoe Club Golf Course

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Yeah, I will wait to hear from my council colleague.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: There is always some risk of pulling an item when the vote at other levels have gone your way with no dissent. But a couple of words in praise of the report. Ben Fey, who has been our head of Golf Services filling the large shoes of his predecessor, Al Shane, has done a…both done a fine job turning around the operations there. Also, we stopped the fog of accounting that we had prior to 2014 with all sorts of debt loaded in and various other costs that did not really relate to the courses themselves. Lo and behold, suddenly they were making a profit. So, I want to thank…This really is, to some extent, a continuation of an arc that began back in 2013 when we voted as a council not to privatize operations at the four unionized sites that we had. Councillor Eadie would have been there. Councillor Orlikow and I voted for that. Then Councillor Vandal kind of took the lead. Mike Davidson from CUPE also worked hard on that file. So, my point in rising is not to speak so much about the Canoe Club, though it is an important part of St. Vital. My point is to say, there is some irony here that we did not vote to bring in-house any portion of the operations at Transit Plus. We did not vote to bring in-house any portion of the operations for garbage, recycle. We did vote for bulky waste back some years ago. We have had pilot projects in. But here we are. We are going to bring back in-house…bring in-house for the first time, actually, at the Canoe Club. The course is more than 100 years old, always been on City land, never operated by the City of Winnipeg. Originally a private club, so I could not play there when I was growing up. Then post-1992, a public course, but we have contracted out the operations. So, good work by Mr. Fey and company at the…at our golf utility, getting it in shape so that we have confidence that the City of Winnipeg can run a golf course at a profit. We always said back in 2013, do not just blame the union here because Kildonan is unionized and runs at a profit. And the accounting was such a mess that if you took Harbourview and everybody worked for free – everybody worked for free – it would still lose money. So, clearly this was not just labour cost that was involved. So, terrific, we will move to bring this in-house. But just bear it in mind, when we hope…I hope what Councillor Eadie's role now as head of Water and Waste, that we can have some of these debates again about can we profitably operate bulky waste pick-up or multi-family pick-up or, frankly, yard waste pick up which is a debate that is all to come as we consider the rates for garbage services as well as we debate the…how we are going to go about going to market on garbage, recycle and compost. And I am probably getting dangerously close to Duncan getting up and saying, this has nothing to do with golf. But the point here is, look, we are bringing this in-house for the first time. We can operate it at a profit with unionized staff. Let's just bear that in mind the next time we start debating something like Councillor Eadie's initiatives over the years about bringing in house bulky waste, some downtown work that Councillor Gilroy has certainly called for in terms of garbage pick up. So, certainly in favour of the report and thanks to the committee for approving it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further speakers, oh, Councillor Chambers first, and then we will close with Councillor Duncan. Councillor Chambers, Deputy Mayor.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today in support of the recommendations to bring in golf services at the Canoe Club in-house. As an avid golfer myself, I mean, you have Tiger Woods, then you have me in the woods. In the woods. Alright.

Madam Speaker: You are getting the clap for that one.

Councillor Chambers: You know, I am always appreciative of the opportunities where, you know, we are maintaining green spaces and amenities for the public to enjoy. Also, recognizing that there is, you know, a golf course, couple

of…couple of kilometers away, the Windsor Park Golf Course and then beside that, the St. Boniface Golf Course. You know, maintaining this allows us…you know, those of us that are avid golfers, to have a nice, nine course…nine-hole course nearby. You know, looking through the report, I am noticing that, you know, there has been a delinquency on the account in terms of paying the property taxes and that there would be a cost to mothballing this amenity, as well. So, having this brought in-house allows us to maintain golf services for those that enjoy it, while not having those other costs in terms of mothballing for something that is just sitting there but still costing us money as we maintain. I have driven by the golf course many times on my way home to south end of the city. And even during the wintertime, there are opportunities to use that space; perhaps groom some trails for cross-country skiing and the like. But there are opportunities to create something more than that is currently existing. So, I think this is a great opportunity. I am encouraging my council colleagues to support this. You know, we had conversation a couple of years back with respect to the Blumberg Golf Course. It is still being maintained, although, there are different entities that want to come in and do different things there. But again, having the opportunity for the Canoe Club to maintain its operations and be profitable, I think with some investments, that is achievable. So, again, I encourage my council colleagues to consider supporting this, the Public Service's recommendation to bring this in-house. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to give a bit of an explanation to the public in terms of what is going on here…People might be surprised that the City is looking at buying a golf club. It was just a few years ago that the City was looking at selling golf clubs. In fact, we have been looking at selling…

Councillor Duncan: …Point of order, Madam Speaker. The City is not looking to buy a golf course here. We own the golf course and we are currently leasing it. Council consideration to repeal that lease, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure, in terms of operation here, Madam Speaker, just in terms of the viability here. There was a point where we were looking at selling our golf courses. Just to explain, Madam Speaker, I was asked about this, why would we be doing it at…this at this time when we are looking at selling off our golf courses in recent years? Happens to be that COVID happens to be the big factor in that golfing got more popular. And so, it has breathed some new life into a sport that could have some potential for the future and therefore, viable, again, for the City to be…to be further involved.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councillor Duncan to close.

Councillor Duncan: Yeah, thank you very much. I appreciate all the comments here today on this. Councillor Mayes speaking to, you know, comparisons about bringing other services in. I would, you know, support that line of thought should the subject be similar as in the current tenant of this golf course, Canoe Club, is delinquent on their '23 and '24 property taxes, as well as now their '24 rent. You know, that there is…you know, it is a glorified dog park at this point in time. So, yes, I understand that we are bringing this in-house. And yes, there is opportunities across departments to look at that. However, at this point in time, this is essentially a must move to have this potentially be a golf course at all or it would be to the point where it would be rundown and a derelict field at some point in time. So, this is good news. Golf Services have assured us that this would be profitable in year one and that they are going to have lots of opportunities to get people out there experience the course and move towards a sustainable future for that City-run course in years ahead. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Duncan. With that, call the question on Item 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now, move into by-laws, Councillor Duncan. Oh, we do have a motion, sorry. One motion here: Motion No. 4, Mr. Clerk. Okay, let's deal with that one. That is a notice of motion moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Schreyer. I have not had a chance to look at this myself. The topic, Mr. Clerk? Okay, yes, I see that here, regarding the Lemay Forest. So, this will be a notice of motion, debatable at next month's Council meeting. Councillor Duncan, by-laws, please.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS Winnipeg City Council must strive to always maintain the highest Quality of Life for the Citizens of the City, but since the creation of the modern day Winnipeg in 1972, our Regional Park System has been underfunded by City Council and therefore has not expanded at an appropriate rate to accommodate Winnipeg's population growth, which has

witnessed thousands of acres of lands inside the City being subject to rezoning, for the purpose of creating new housing, commercial and industrial subdivision developments since 1972.

AND WHEREAS with the City failing to create enough new Regional Parks, strategically located in all parts of Winnipeg, the lack of Council leadership on this matter has negatively affected Winnipeg's ability to meet the ever increasing demand for recreational opportunities and green spaces (both natural and traditional park space).

AND WHEREAS the existence of a strong regional park and park system is one of the key indicators used in study after study that rates the 'livability' of North American Cities, as said park systems affect both the perceived and the real health, wellness and beauty of a city, therefore impacting the competitive ability for a city to market itself as a 'City of Choice' where one chooses to live or relocate a company, for the purpose of Live, Work, and Play.

AND WHEREAS inside the Lemay Forest a Ceremonial Sweat Lodge has operated as a spiritual gathering place for decades, attended by Indigenous and non-Indigenous citizens alike.

AND WHEREAS the Sisters of Misericordia ran an orphanage for young children and infants in St. Norbert between 1904 and 1948; professional archivists and an expert in Catholic history, employing the Sisters of Misericordia's own Admissions Registers, have established that 3,383 children and infants died at the Asile Ritchot orphanage in St. Norbert in those years; most were buried in unmarked communal graves in a cemetery established in Lemay Forest; according to the Archaeological Unit of the Historic Resources Branch there is evidence the bodies were not removed; that according to the Archaeological Unit past practice meant that members of the surrounding communities likely buried loved ones close to the cemetery and possibly elsewhere in the forest; therefore the entire Lemay Forest may hold human remains;

AND WHEREAS the land referred to as the Lemay Forest lands, was, during this present term of office, subject to a Public Hearing Rezoning at the Riel Community Committee, which recommended the denial of rezoning, for a proposed housing development, with the said recommendation for the DENIAL OF REZONING being CONFIRMED by decision of the City of Winnipeg City Council, thus this decision by Winnipeg City Council, pertaining to this specific parcel of land, now REPRESENTS the APPROVED Council Policy, which up to and including this point, had not formally stated in any way a different Council policy direction, as it pertains to this parcel of land, as Council preserves the all rights guaranteed to it under the City of Winnipeg Charter, namely the said powers provided for and by the Province of Manitoba, through the Public Hearing Rezoning process, thus securing and strengthening the City of Winnipeg position prior to land expropriation, as COUNCIL has now determined the land value that is reflected in its present land use, which is non-developable/non-growable agrarian lands (what is known as 'pasture lands') thus minimizing the capital cost impact to the City for acquiring the said land by the City, as the City can now successfully present a position in the Land Expropriation process that provides for a land evaluation which is consistent with lands known as non-developable/non-growable agrarian lands, or what is known as 'pasture lands', which presently has a value of $1000 to $10,000 an acre, for land located in and around the City of Winnipeg.

AND WHEREAS the Lemay Forest has recently been threatened due to the existing private property owners' appeared and publicly stated desire to immediately cut down and destroy the entire existing forest, along with its biodiversity therein.

AND WHEREAS the creation of a new Regional Park in the historic location known as the 'Lemay Forest' will add a new city park to the underfunded and under dedicated park system inside the City.

AND WHEREAS the said location for a new City Regional Park, is home to endangered and threatened species protected under the federal Species At Risk Act as well as woodpecker population protected under the Migratory Bird Regulations, and is a forest of such age that it can not be replaced in a human lifetime, thus guaranteeing that this land needs to be preserved for the said wildlife, along with being a new park that can be enjoyed by citizens and species in future generations.

AND WHEREAS the creation of this new Park shall successfully add a new park to Winnipeg's existing Regional Park System, and therefore presents an opportunity for Winnipeg to provide a practical demonstration of City Council's sincere desire to live up to its signatory decision to join the Montreal Accord for Biodiversity, an accord which demands that communities make a higher commitment to the preservation of the natural world, and therefore the assembling of the said lands for a new park is consistent with existing City Park Policy.

AND WHEREAS one of the few key and strategic access points for the proposed new City park is via Rue Landry, which has a connection to an existing City of Winnipeg Right-Of-Way (an ROW which runs in an East/West direction, backing onto homes located on the north side of Lemay Avenue), as the said ROW, at its eastern boundary, provides for a direct connection into the Lemay Forest lands.

Therefore Be It Resolved:

1. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to undertake the following:*

   A. *Initiate the process required in order to Rezone to a PR 'Park' zoning classification, an existing City of Winnipeg Right-Of-Way (ROW) which runs in an East/West direction, backing onto homes located on the north side of Lemay Avenue, abutting up and connecting to an eastern portion of the Rue Landry ROW.*

   B. *Immediately expropriate all of the privately held lands known as the Lemay Forest, which includes forested lands, newly unforested lands, and open lands, that constitute the privately-owned land, popularly referred to as the Lemay Forest lands or property, for the purpose of creating a new City of Winnipeg Regional Park.*

   C. *The expropriation should include all the privately held land including Lemay Forest Title #1: 2927614/1, Lemay Forest Title #2: 2927613/1, and 823 Lemay Ave Title 3039746/1, commonly referred to the Lemay lands, the Lemay Forest, by the community, and that was, in this term of office, subject to a Public Hearing Rezoning at the Riel Community Committee, which recommended that the application for rezoning be rejected, a decision which was adopted by Council, in order to ensure a proper and comprehensive land assembly for the creation of a single new Regional Park, and therefore specifically that the two parcels of land, namely the said ROW referred to in Recommendation 1.A., and the Lemay Forest Lands referred to in Recommendation 1.B., as well as the lands referred to in this Recommendation, shall represent the lands required to create one new Regional Park.*

2. *That the successful or unsuccessful rezoning of the said ROW land parcel will not negate in anyway the direction given herein by Council to immediately secure the lands known as the Lemay Forest via expropriation, as referred to in the above Recommendation.*

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

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

Councillor Duncan: Thank you. Madam Speaker, I would like to move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 17/2025, By-law No. 20/2025, By-law No. 21/2025.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 17/2025, By-law No. 20/2025, By-law No. 21/2025.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

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

Councillor Duncan: Madam Speaker, I move that the following by-laws be read a second time: By-law No. 123/2024, By-law No. 12/2025.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 123/2024, By-law No. 12/2025.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: I will move that the By-law Nos. 123/2024 and 12/2025.be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Next section, please.

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

Councillor Duncan: I will move that the following by-laws be read a first time: number…By-law No. 19/2025, By-law No. 25/2025.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 19/2025, By-law No. 25/2025.

Councillor Duncan: I will also move that By-law Nos. 19/2025 and 25/2025 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 19/2025 and 25/2025.

Councillor Duncan: And Madam Speaker, I will move that the rules be suspended and that By-law Nos. 19/2025 and 25/2025 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 is carried. We will now have question period under this committee. First question, Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker, I rise as the Councillor is away right now, we still have a city where we have by-law enforcement under many jurisdictions, and I know the Councillor is personally…at least he has communicated to me privately, and I do not think I am saying anything out of school, that he is in favour of a consolidated by-law enforcement unit. In light of the fact that, not just citizens are confused, members of Council are confused, with regards to by-law enforcement at times. And knowing full well if you just have to take a drive around the city to see by-laws being not enforced. However, it is hard not to read in our newspapers that enforcement officers are going after seniors because they do not have a railing on their front walkway going up to the house, yet we see by-laws being violated across our city that are far more significant and do not seem to be getting enforced. So I guess the first part of my question is, what steps can be taken to get a process underway so that we can have one consolidated by-law enforcement unit that would be completely integrated together, so that there would be one-stop shop to be able to call to enforce a by-law no matter what by-law that is and no matter what department it may have been generated from, but nevertheless, one unit to enforce all by-laws with expertise and fields that are not just one, but in one unit, one call, one stop. How soon can we get this process underway to create that department if we are going to do it?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Yes, Madam Speaker, Councillor Wyatt is correct. I am in favour of exploring…having all of our by-laws under one roof with one direction and I will double-down on that and be proactive instead of reactive in the City of Winnipeg because those are a lot of calls that…and emails that I am receiving as area Councillor of Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood about, why are things not being done when City staff are driving by? Unfortunately, has to be cycled through the 311 system predominantly. There are instances obviously for life safety that that is not the case. My understanding is that there is a report coming forward from a motion, I want to say, that we put forward going on a year ago. That obviously can be quicker, but I am in favour of moving in that direction. I think that…for those that do not know, by-laws are not in one area at the City of Winnipeg. You have by-laws at Public Works, you have by-laws with Water and Waste, you have by-laws with Fire, you have by-laws with Property and Development. I think it also makes the City of Winnipeg an attractive investment option for folks that could come in and say, here is our by-laws, here are our procedures, and they go through and make a decision. So yes, I will…I will continue to work and advocate if Council is willing to move forward on a one consolidated by-law enforcement proactive position.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: And knowing…and I want to preface as well by saying that, by far the majority of citizens of businesses out there do follow our by-laws. It is unfortunate it is a minority or a small group, but nevertheless, enough that it is having an impact on the visibility of our city, the beauty of our city, neighbourhoods in our city. What can be done though…my specific question to the last question which kind of was not answered which was, what steps have to be taken to get process going, so we are not waiting for a report, that we can get this moving, so that we can have one consolidated by-law enforcement unit up and running before this term is out, which is fastly approaching? What steps can be taken so that we can get this…because it is going to take some time to assemble staff, to get training, to get organized…

Madam Speaker: …Thank you...

Councillor Wyatt: …I understand that, but my concern is that we are still waiting on a report that we had moved on from some time ago and hasn't happened, this may not happen at all.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Yeah, I share those concerns with the Councillor, Madam Speaker. Property and Development specifically has been working diligently to address a lot of the burnt-out rubble sites across the city of Winnipeg, and have made significant improvements in their processes to hook up with Hydro and get things done to make sure that they are communicating clearly across departments and seeing their reaction to items that are brought to their attention actually come down into less than 48 hours when they are actually on-site and are working towards that. So, at the end of the day, it is our job as Council to direct the Public Service through motions. I think that, again, we have a report coming forward. How can I speed it up, I am not sure at this point in time exactly what we could do today to have that, but again, I am willing to work on motions to continue to push that ball down the…or up the hill, I should say.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: And I know what works sometimes…thank you for the answer. I know we are sometimes hesitant to necessarily, you know, air the so-called dirty laundry for everybody to see that…where we are falling short, but sometimes if you do not have that information, we do not know what to address. So maybe the thought would be to start with a SWOT analysis. Where are our strengths? Where are our weaknesses? Where are we falling short at pertaining to each by-law we do not have? And just to give you a quick example of my preamble, but…for example, in our last meeting at P and D, when we heard that something like a…we got it down now to 40 fire piles that are still out there. Well that is not great news in my opinion, though it is somewhat celebrated at committee because it dropped from 79. But you know nonetheless, we have neighbourhoods that have literally a house that was burnt out collapsed and there is still houses out there that are burnt but standing, partially. And the safety issues and the look of that and the impact that has on the neighbourhood. Maybe we need to step it up by saying we should do a SWOT analysis and we want an immediate response that where are we falling short, where should the resources be, where should people be moved from one department to another, where do we need the training, and get moving on this so we can bring a report back and a reorganization plan if we are going to truly train one enforcement unit.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Loud and clear, I hear you. We will work towards that.

Madam Speaker: Very good. Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. As we all know, we are going through some of…have been and will continue to go through some rezoning. And I have tried, I really have tried to work with the administration to try to get some actual numbers on what the loss to LDR will be, what the loss to revenue will be to the department regarding the as of right. I will…I hope to…I am asking today, is as I continue to beat my head against this wall because I think it is very important that Council knows when making decisions when is that financial impact, as we know that the LDR is very important to ward councillors. I know the Mayor has promised in the past to help me out through there. I have not seen anything yet. I will probably do my own. But what I am asking for is, is I am going to go beat my head against this wall again, because now we know that some potential changes are going to be, again, changing from other changes we have done in the past, just to help me get the numbers we need. That is all I…can I get a commitment, just some help?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Yeah, I am more than willing to work with Councillor Orlikow on that. Obviously, this is a sticking point for some that are undecided on where they are going with this potential four-units as of right. What happens to the LDR, it is important to all of our communities. I have learned in my short time as Councillor that if we want to continue to

rejuvenate our communities, especially our parks spaces and, you know, occasionally we go against the rules and allocate that money towards other things with the Council consent, it is a key part of the puzzle for continuing to build our community. So yes, Councillor Orlikow. Through you, Madam Speaker, I will work with you to get an answer.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our question period here. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste and the Environment. Councillor Eadie, Mr. Chair, your report dated February 3rd.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT DATED FEBRUARY 3, 2025

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to move the report of the Water, Waste and Environment Committee, February 3rd, consent agenda Items 1 through 4.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Now, we have no by-laws today. Oh, we do have a by-law today. Councillor Eadie.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS

Councillor Eadie: Have a by-law? Yes. Madam Speaker, I would like to move first reading of By-law No. 22/2025, a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 22/2025.

Councillor Eadie: Alright, I would like to move by-law 20…second reading of By-law 22/2025.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 22/2025.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. Alright, I will try to remember the wording off the top of my head. I would like to move to suspend the rules to have third reading of By-law 22/2025 be passed and ordered to signed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period under this committee. Any questions for Chair Councillor Eadie? Not today. Okay, let's move on. Not today. Okay. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Community Services. Councillor Allard will take the report today for Chair Councillor Santos, in her absence.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED FEBRUARY 5, 2025

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Chairperson, I would like to move consent agenda.

Madam Speaker: Okay. It is Item 1 and 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have no by-laws under this committee. And Councillor Allard really wants to take questions. Any questions? Okay, not today. Thank you, Councillor Allard. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works. Councillor Lukes.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED FEBRUARY 14, 2025**

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I would like to move consent…well, I would like to move Items 2 and 3 and I would like to pull Item 1.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Winnipeg Parking Authority 2025 Business Plan. Call the question on Item 2 and 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Lukes: Okay.

Madam Speaker: Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Winnipeg Parking Authority 2025 Business Plan

Councillor Lukes: Sure, I am pulling this to just bring this to Council's attention. You will probably be receiving some media updates on this. So, as many of you know, we have got between 11 and 12 million dollars in outstanding fines; About seven million in parking fines, and the balance in MBEA fines which would be like long grass and other issues. So, we have about 12 million in outstanding fines. So, you will recall over a year ago, we requested…we sent a letter to the Province requesting changes in legislation so that we could, like the Province does, have the ability to collect these outstanding fines with more teeth. If the Province has a fine like if you do not pay your child payments, they can actually restrict you from getting your driver's license or insurance. We also asked the Province perhaps we could…that we would like to put these fines on the property tax bill, but we have not heard back anything definitive from the Province even though I have spoken to the municipal minister and, you know, brought this up with my MLA. So, what the Public Service or what the Winnipeg Parking Authority is doing now, and this is what you will be receiving notice on, currently, if you have three tickets and the parking…parking people see that you have got three tickets, they can tow your vehicle to a compound. You will then have to pay the tow charges. We can not collect your parking tickets, but you will have to pay your towing fee. Hopefully that is a catalyst or an inspiration for you to pay the rest of your tickets. That is being reduced to two tickets. So, if you have got two parking tickets, the Parking Authority has the ability to call a towing company to tow you to a compound. The other change that is now going to be happening is the Parking Authority will, if you have got overdue parking tickets or MBEA fines, they will send you a letter saying, look, pay your fine within 30 days or we will send this information off to the credit bureau. So, it will impact your credit. So, the Parking Authority has indicated to us, or we have asked them, the Public Works Committee has asked them, to give councillors notification when this is about to happen. I believe the credit bureau is going to start in August and the two tow…two tickets and a tow will happen probably in another six to eight weeks. So, just as a heads up. And hoping maybe someone from the Province is listening. 12 million dollars is about two points on a raise in taxes. So, the City would really, really appreciate having a little bit more authority to collect these overdue fines. So, I just wanted to bring that to your attention. So, now, I will put it forward that we can move Item No. 1, also.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, for…I would like to thank the Chair for standing down this item, the Winnipeg Parking Authority 2025 Business Plan. Just to put some comments on the record, it was January of last year, January of 2024, when this Council moved and approved a decision to do the renovation on the Millennium Library parkade. After significant Q&A during our budget session, not this last budget we just dealt with, but the budget before. There were some real discrepancies that I found, went through the Q&A and I think the committee heard them with regards to our parking authority. And the analysis done whereby they were also not only the judge but the jury, in a sense, in deciding and recommending to us whether or not we should retain the parkade or sell the parkade. I guess most concerning in the discussions, that I felt, was the response from the head of the Parking Authority who argued, but then was corrected by other staff, that…and it was concerning to hear that was that we cannot sell it because we have a library above. But yet, when it came to the Winnipeg parkade…square, we not only had a library, we had a…we had stores above and we actually sold parking underneath, as well. So, you can do a separate title to allow that to occur. But it appears that we have now entered into an agreement or we…Council has been given authority to spend up to 30 million dollars, though, they had, in two years before, an appraisal done as high as 50 million for the renovations once fully implemented. We gave them the go ahead of about 14, 15 million and moving up to 30 million in the next phase. And I am concerned, Madam Speaker, that we are potentially at the same time as going…that the authority who did the analysis to retain the parkade and give us the arguments and a scoring system, apparently, that weigh…that…because they have not…they were not prepared, Madam Speaker, to forward me a copy. I have not received it as of yet, of the analysis of the weighing system and how they develop that with the consultant that they hired. And so, it is something that I really would encourage EPC to think about and to put it on their table to revisit. Because you know, we are…we had this discussion earlier about

infrastructure projects and the lack of borrowing capacity of the City or the need to have borrowing capacity. And this is a project which is still concerning me that we gave authority to the parkade…to the parking agency of the City of Winnipeg before with the renovation of that parkade. But we may have not necessarily been given all the information. And I say this not 100 percent sure. I will say that, but I will say that there is…there is enough red flags going up for me to question whether or not we should have given that go ahead on maintaining…keeping the parkade and going ahead with the capital project to renovate it ourselves versus selling it and letting the private sector do that, as well as retaining the funds from the sale. The other part of the concern I have with this department, I just want to say, is I know they generate a dividend to us every year. But, having sat on the Public Works Committee, it appears to me that we could probably see a higher dividend. And I had to ask questions at the time about the amount of management versus employees. And it appears there is about a two-to-one ratio. Now, to the defence of the Parking Authority, they have argued that, well, a lot of their management is managing the contracts of those out there issuing the tickets. Now, having said that, when you read the contracts, the contracts reverses the onus on the contractor versus the City to administer. In many ways, it almost administers themselves. And so, the question is why do we have such a high management? Now, it is true, the Parking Authority has taken on new responsibility, such as taxi regulations and overseeing that. But I think that is something that we really need to look into is the level of management and how much management has been…has grown inside that agency. Because, definitely, the dividend could be generated or if we can rationalize or get revenues up, as well. And this is the third point I want to make is that if you walk around the downtown, and I realize that a lot of people have these apps and they pay for parking now on the apps, but a lot of people do not. And my thought, Madam Speaker, is that we should make it easy…as easy as possible to pay for parking in downtown Winnipeg. But now, if you try to find a machine, quite often, it is not even the same block, or it is a block away at the end of that block. And a lot of folks who are…who have disabilities, who are seniors, mobility issues, I think it is inherently unfair. And I have raised this a number of times with the head of the Parking Authority. It does not seem to be a priority to him. At least, I did not get a sense, maybe I am wrong. But I would really think that this could be something that could be addressed. And a lot of the machines that are out there, parking meters, if you call them that, they are not really that…parking machines now, I guess, are very dilapidated. You know, they have not been maintained. They have been beaten up by snowplows and everything else. Just a reflection on our downtown. So, I would hope that…I am not on the standing committee anymore, but that these thoughts are noted. I am glad to hear about the enforcement of parking tickets. But at the same time, Madam Speaker, I think the Parking Authority…and I will give one other thought; you know, the Parking Authority, there is nothing like competition to ensure that an authority, whether it be government or private sector, you know, pencils are sharpened, you know, doing the best they can. You know, any thought given…and it is just a thought, that maybe the Parking Authority needs to be more than one parking authority. Maybe we need a parking authority north of Portage and the parking authority south of Portage. And let's see who can generate more revenue. And let's see who could be…run more efficiently. In other words, we do not necessarily need one parking authority, we could actually have one…we could have two or three, maybe, in the downtown alone and let them compete and see what they could do with developing policy to make the downtown more popular, effective to be a place to shop and work and live and play. But also, in terms of how the agency itself is being managed today. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Very good, thank you. Councillor Lukes to close.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, thank you very much for your comments there, Councillor Wyatt. I think that there is going to be a lot happening with parking coming up. We have got the parking strategy that is going to come forward after the Transportation Master Plan. I expect that the Transportation Master Plan will come forward in April and then in May will be the parking strategy. And they are going to come forward with some new revenue generating opportunities. And there are other revenue generating opportunities that have risen in many discussions over the past few months. It is quite incredible how much parking and towing and storage occurs in this city for parking. So, we will be having a lot of good conversations on revenue-making opportunities for the Parking Authority coming forward. And I know that they have got some, you know, let's say interesting discussions about these meters that will be coming forward. It will be a lively discussion, I think. I fear. Anyways, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I will call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will now go into question period under this committee. Okay, Councillor Schreyer.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Schreyer: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Speaker. So Councillor Lukes was rather constructive in giving us a timeline of what is going on and I just want to clarify, because she was giving us all a warning, Madam Speaker. And I just want to get it…get it right, because it sounds like she has got the timeline down, I just want to be clear, lest I have not three but just two parking tickets, and that applies to all Winnipeggers, my understanding was she says, this…in…it is

going to be about eight weeks in which this will be implemented, and then we will have 30 days' notice, something like that, if you have two parking tickets. And I just wanted…if she can give…clarify that timeline for us, so everyone has due warning as she is willing to give us this afternoon.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Okay. So…and I will email this to you so you also have it in writing, but the collection agency will be sending both parking and MBEA tickets to impact credit ratings, anticipating this to happen over the next month. So, I receive this in the middle of February so, they will give us an email also and tell us. We will have some…we will have a press release or something on it, and then the two-ticket towing will come into effect by August of 2025. Corporate Communications is working on this, and what I would add is if you do not know, and this all started…and I want to thank the Public Works Committee. This all started over a year ago, I got a…I got a collection agency ticket from four years ago, and it was the first collection agency ticket that I…notification that I got. So, I started investigating. What is this all about? We went down the rabbit hole, big rabbit hole, found out, you know, 11 to 12 million outstanding. We had met with Parking Authority, the Public Works Committee had met with Public…with Parking Authority. We had some really good suggestions about credit ratings and towing and such, which the Parking Authority did implement. So, if people are not sure if they have parking tickets, you can call 311 to find out. And when we do these releases that will be clearly stated in the release that, if you do not know…I did not know, my husband is a…just ferociously pays every ticket he gets, but, somehow, I guess, this one was missed and after four years, we got our first notification from the collection agency. Anyways, we since changed collection agencies, I will have you note also, but you…we will…can call 311 to see if you got outstanding parking tickets.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. To be clear, we are talking about parking tickets, not speeding tickets. Does she have anything to say about that?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Yeah. Speeding tickets are not under the Parking Authority.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Rollins, followed by Councillor Wyatt, and then Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. Two questions, Madam Speaker, one different than the next. One is, recently King and Bannatyne was announced through the Public Works and the Public Service report to be the area for the scramble cross, and Madam Speaker, I do not know if you heard, but you could probably hear folks in Osborne Village shuffling their feet and looking down because of course, they felt very much that it was their motion, the motion of the Osborne Village Biz and their scramble crossing ambitions that led to this report in part. So, could the Chair of Public Works say, and to this question, Madam Speaker, why is there still hope for a scramble cross in Osborne Village? Why is there still hope…why should there still be hope in the hearts of Osborne Village BIZ who so wanted the scramble crossing?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Well, you know, we are all here because we all have hope, right? We are all here because we are optimistic and we have hope, and we are going to be discussing this scramble project in great detail on March 4th at the Public Works Committee. So, I say, in anything related to active transportation, never give up hope.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, parking. Parking is a big issue in the downtown. It is an issue related to economic development for them. Unlike many places in the city, there is paid parking meters. So, could the Chair clarify what we are looking for in store? She hinted towards it a bit and said there was going to be changes. Question one: Can she expand? Can she clarify? And question two: What impact will there be on the downtown economy, Madam Speaker, being important for all of Council?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Sure. So in talking with the Parking Authority, they have noted, and as Councillor Wyatt noted, that a lot of these parking meter machines are very old, they are rusty, they are not…after the plows and everything go through, they go out every spring and they check and see which ones are stable and which ones need to be removed. So, we are expecting probably more to be removed and I am not clear on this, so I do not really want to get in to it, but I do believe

there is some…some technology that is expiring. So, I am not sure exactly what the Parking Authority is going to be bringing forward yet related to parking meters and the paying of parking, but it sounds like there are some changes coming due to the old machines, the rusting machines, and the fact that some technology is nearing its end of life. So, stay tuned, I guess, is all I know right now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Wyatt: I guess I take a play…a line out of former Premier Gary Filmon who kept saying…said, well I am going to give you…I will support the city with more money when you get your financial house in order. And I guess I say the same about Parking Authority, we have raised a lot of questions. They are quick to come back, we are looking at expanding parking…or paid parking, around the city outside, the downtown. But even before that happens, my question, Madam Speaker, is this; That…that it appears one of the things I was able to gather is that, one of the things that seems to have occurred is that, when the change was made where it was once an SOA where the CEO reported directly to the CAO, changed to report via the Director of Public Works, that…there seems to be a change, and I…you know, and I…I am not putting any…pointing any fingers but, you know, the Director of Public Works is quite a busy person managing all the roads and construction and so on, everything. Is there any thought given to maybe restructuring the reporting structure to bring greater accountability in terms of Parking Authority that maybe has been lost? Because we have a Director who has got many stuff on his plate with regards to running the Department of Public Works, that maybe we need to bring it back under the CAO's Office to address these issues and to start to sort them out, because what I get a sense here is that we are kind of spinning our wheel. We are talking about the same things that we were talking about when I was on the committee. Those machines, the state of machines, the state of…you know, the issues with regards to outstanding tickets. All this has been going on for a while now. Too long. And so, my thought is, maybe that is something to be considering. You have any thoughts on that, Madam Chair?

Councillor Lukes: I think in my experience with the Parking Authority lately and in my experience with parking and towing and issues, I think there is a lot of opportunity to increase revenue for the City of Winnipeg. I think we will wait 'til they come forward with their plan in April and then I encourage everyone to actually really take some time and go through the plan and get engaged in it, because the Parking Authority…more and more people, more and more vehicles, more and more dead cars, parking cars, towing, it is never-ending, right? It is never-ending. It is actually when…I have done a lot of work on this recently, and when you really get into understanding the movement of vehicles and how they are moving, being ticketed, being towed, it is…it is incredible. There are incredible opportunities there. Where it lands, whether it ends up out of the CAO or a committee under the Director, that is something I think we can talk about when this…their new proposal comes forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Wyatt: Second question. My question is regarding the…as I have previously mentioned here in my speech, the outstanding questions from over a year ago, about a year ago, that I had forwarded the Parking Authority about the Millennium Parkade, the decision to sell or not to sell and the analysis that was done. What did you…would the Chair be prepared if I were to dig up all those questions that have gone unanswered to be able to forward them on to her office, to consider and then consider requesting responses…to questions that still remain outstanding, which are quite a number? Thank you.

Councillor Lukes: Sure. And if you could also get the clerk to send a clip of the video, because that was a very good meeting, we had a lot of good discussion in the video. So, do the video, and then do the questions and we will go down that rabbit hole.

Councillor Wyatt: And it is more, are you aware…

Madam Speaker: …Okay, I think that is number four, isn't it?

Councillor Wyatt: I…this is my third question. Third.

Madam Speaker: Okay, let's go.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for mentioning the video clip of the meeting, about the budget meeting a year ago, and that at the time I had an executive assistant who actually had a PhD and he watched it numerous times and…so we came to the same conclusions. And so I just wanted to…are you aware I appreciate the fact that you are interested in this matter? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councillor Lukes? Thank you. Councillor Chambers and then Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to ask the Chair a question. You know, previously, there was a system in place in terms of the collection of unpaid parking tickets where the potential individual would receive a letter from a company from Quebec if I recall correctly. I am wondering if the Chair could comment on the efficacy of those collections as compared to the system that we have in place now, where a local company has been retained to assist, again in the potential seizure of the vehicle impounding, and potential sale of that vehicle to satisfy outstanding fees as a result of unpaid parking tickets, towing and impounding of vehicles.

Councillor Lukes: Sure, so the City did put out an RFP for a new collection agency because the term had come up. We have a new collection agency, they are a national organization. We…they have an office here in Winnipeg, and what is happening also that came out of the Public Works meeting when we met with the Parking Authority, maybe we should meet with them on a more regular basis, but was the seizure aspect. So, what we have seen is, from collections, we have seen…I do not have it in front of me but I believe it was an 80 percent increase in…what was it? Eight-five percent increase in collection when we were dealing with the seizures of vehicles, not so much with just sending letters and ticketing with three tows. That is why we are trying to tap it to two tows and the collection agency aspect…or the credit bureau aspect, but we have seen an increase but again, I do believe that is because we put pressure on the Parking Authority to do more seizures.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Two documents that we have been waiting for for some time that still are not on the March agenda for Public Works. The Transportation Master Plan, not the transit but the Transportation Master Plan, and the report on the Study of 30 and 40-kilometre speed limits across the whole city. Do we have a time estimate on both of those reports? Because my sense was at least the transportation one was coming in December.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Yeah, great questions. Yes, the Transportation Master Plan did go to the Province and it sat…it did not sit, it was being circulated and reviewed within the Province. So, we are anticipating…this is what the Public Works Department told us…just told me just the other day: April. April is when we are expecting to see the Transportation Master Plan. So, what I have asked the Public Works Department to do is to set up another…I guess we will call it a Council seminar, maybe it is a lunch-and-learn, but it is going to be about an hour and a half to two hours for everyone so that we can go through the Transportation Master Plan. Yes, it will be a meeting of Council that, you know, is, I guess in the boardroom across the street. And I will give you the opportunity to ponder and ask questions because it is a lot of information. It is Goods Movement. It is the Pedestrian and Cycling Strategy. And all of this information, by the way, is on the web. There is information out there. You can call…you could read it and call up the Department any day you want, but what we have got…we…you will recall we had open houses on this. People gave feedback. There will be some tweaks, but the majority of information that is on the website is the information that will be coming forward. So, I have asked for a presentation on that, I have also asked for the 30, 40k for the residential streets. That is anticipated to come in April also. It is going to be a doozy of an April, maybe May, but I said, let's do it together, just get it over with. And we will do also a Council presentation on the 30, 40k, so that if you have any questions, you want to go through it…Okay, we will just do it slowly.

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

Councillor Mayes: So, just a bit confused there. So, been my impression, Council seminars are at the discretion of the CAO…

Councillor Lukes: …Yeah, maybe it is not. Maybe it is a lunch-and-learn. I do not know what they want to call it, but I have…maybe it is a lunch-and-learn...

Madam Speaker: …There are Council information sessions. We have done them before, thank you…

Councillor Lukes: …Council info-sessions. I just really like in Public Works to share information with people and you guys have seen that. And while we are talking about it, I will talk about April 26th. On April 26th, the Public Works Department has agreed to doing a presentation on active transportation over the next six years and also on road safety. So, we are going to be holding it at the Convention Centre, in the theatre at the Convention Centre. It will be a public information session. I mean, if…I am inviting…

Madam Speaker: …Thank you, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: …everyone to come.

Madam Speaker: Email us. Thank you. Councillor Allard, are you still in the queue?

Councillor Allard: I will be making a few…I will be speaking a few words in French. So, for those who want to follow with the interpreter.

Councillor Allard: ***(French Spoken - 3:25:03 PM to 3:25:06 PM)***

Madam Speaker: Time on the clock, here.

Councillor Allard: I am not going to take that much time…

Madam Speaker: …but Councillor Schreyer will give extension of time for two minutes, for *en français*. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Allard: ***(French Spoken 3:25:19 PM to 3:25:46 PM)***

Councillor Allard: So, in English…

Councillor Allard: ***(French Spoken 3:25:52 to 3:25:55)***

Councillor Allard: Should I repeat the question? I will…

Councillor Allard: ***(French Spoken 3:25:57 to 3:26:31)***

Councillor Allard: So, in a nutshell, the question is…well, they say do not ask a question if you do not already know the answer in Question Period, but I really do not have the answer and I would like to know. Is it possible, would there be a will, why do we have a standalone Transit Master Plan, standalone Active Transportation Strategies, and I think the more important, at least the one that we give more attention to the Transportation Master Plan. Seems to me Transit should be…should be up there. So, it is…I have never…quite understood why we have different streams. Seems to me Transit should be right in there with the Transportation Master Plan, so.

Councillor Allard: ***(French Spoken 3:27:18 to 3:27:20)***

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Allard. Councillor Lukes, your response *en français.*

Councillor Lukes: *Non*.

Madam Speaker: Not today, anyways. Not today.

Councillor Lukes: I am trying to understand the question here but, I mean, if I understand the question correctly, it is like, why don't we have one big plan. But I guess we do have one big plan, we just do not put it all in one big document because the Transit folks and the Transportation Department, they have worked together, they have worked together with Active Transportation, all these departments have worked together, but they are all detailed in their own realms. So, I can not answer that, I guess. I am not sure. I am not sure the question to answer it, so.

Councillor Allard: Yeah, well I did not ask…I did not know…I did not know the answer.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, time is…

Councillor Allard: So, the…yeah, the follow-up is…

Madam Speaker: …There is no time on the clock right now. Okay, but you can follow-up offline, certainly. Okay, moving on, the Standing Policy Committee on Finance and Economic Development. There is no report today, but there is Motion 5, moved by Councillor Eadie and seconded by Councillor Lukes. It is an automatic referral to this standing committee, and the topic is infill development and some data around that. We have no by-laws under this committee. Question period will be taken by Councillor Lukes today. Any funding you want for you ward or anything, ask the question. Alright, no questions today. We will reserve for them for Councillor Browaty when he returns. Mr. Mayor, will you move adjournment?

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
NO REPORT**

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS**

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

WHEREAS the discussion about housing and population in greenfield versus infill development is difficult to define in actual numbers;

AND WHEREAS Council previously received two reports in regards to population growth in wards, and new housing units by ward, which allowed for an unstructured calculation on population growth generated by new housing;

AND WHEREAS it is important to know whether greenfield development or infill development derives more people per unit of housing built, to make future decisions on dealing with population growth;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Service be directed to create a data model which estimates the number of people per new unit of housing created in each ward, and when new population statistics are provided by neighbourhood, that the same model be used to provide the number of people per new unit of housing by neighbourhood.

Mayor Gillingham: Absolutely.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Roll call, Madam Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 3:29 p.m.