

RM OF SPRINGFIELD COUNCIL NOTES
Tuesday, February 2, 2021

WITHOUT PREJUDICE (E&OE)

APOLOGIES FOR THE LENGTH BUT FEEL ALL THIS IS IMPORTANT

I am attaching a publication from the Springfield Democratic Development Group regarding a Budget Consultation meeting being held by the RM of Springfield Thursday, February 11 at 6:30 p.m. where ratepayers can express their opinions about RM spending, in particular related to the proposed Recreation Centre to be located adjacent to the RM Administration Building. Also attached are two articles from the Winnipeg Free Press to these notes. The first one deals with recreation. The Mayor and Council are promoting a Recreation Centre in Oakbank which they say can be built in segments but currently are looking at an \$18 million dollar proposal which would only provide, as an addition to what existing community clubs offer, an indoor turf surface. The Cooks Creek Community Club currently has a hall large enough to accommodate court sports and track capabilities as well as a large stage for events and kitchen facilities and a smaller hall a 10 minute drive from Oakbank. We have seen parents already drive their children to the skate park adjacent to the RM Building in Oakbank. How much use would we get from a turf surface compared to the cost of maintaining and replacing it on a regular basis as required? This facility would be run by paid staff, not volunteers from the community, as with other community centres. Councillor Wilson researched the economic viability of such a facility with existing ones in Winnipeg and found they were under-utilized and costly. Further COVID 19 has changed the whole dynamic of this project and a cautionary approach would be well advised, particularly as thus far there has been no "buy-in" from the community. The second attachment from the WFP is an article about how the CAO and Council of Selkirk are taking a more significant approach to Planning in their jurisdiction and includes a quote from Duane Nicol, their CAO, as follows: "As we're looking to attract more residents to Selkirk, we're looking to specifically attract individuals who are interested in and are passionate about environmental protection and being climate-conscious," Nicol says. There is likely to be a mandate for how much land must be devoted to public green space. One section is designated for the creation of a mixed-use village that will include residential and commercial space, but no single-family homes. In other sections, the strategy anticipates the inclusion of a variety of housing sizes and types; any single family homes will be pre-approved for secondary suites. A key requirement listed in the land development strategy is that developers "demonstrate leadership in sustainable forms of development and green technologies to mitigate and adapt to climate change." I have met Mr. Nicol and I know Selkirk is very fortunate to have him as a CAO.

AGENDA - Be it resolved that the agenda be amended: add Trails Manitoba Grant Program to New Business. Mayor Fell - Just to make a quick change, so I know the delegation is after the By-law reading but it will be "bumped up" before the reading of the by-law. **CARRIED 6-0**

ELECTED OFFICIALS REPORTS - Councillors Fuhl, Bredin, Wilson and Ralke's reports are on the agenda but Councillor Williams is not and neither is Mayor Fell's report. **NOTE: It is a simple matter to keep a list of the events/meetings one has attended for the month. Elected officials should be required to keep their constituents apprised of the work they are doing on their behalf and that would be particularly true of the Mayor who represents the entire municipality yet Mayor Fell has to be continually reminded to produce reports. I understand there may be a valid reason for Councillor William's missing report.**

VERBAL CONFERENCE REPORT - Mayor Fell - This was probably mislabeled. It is just a request to bring up some points from a conference that Councillor Wilson attended. Councillor Wilson sent out an e-mail with some points so I thought we could forward that on to Administration to review ??? and then come back to us when they "can update on some of those questions that you had or would like an update on". Councillor Wilson - "Yes, that would be fine. That was actually an agenda item that I had suggested so that all of Council could put their thoughts forward on the different webinars and conferences that they had attended that week. It just seemed there were so much going on that week that it would be nice to share some of our experiences and ideas." Mayor Fell - Council, if you have anything else that you'd like to e-mail to the CAO, that would be fine too. **NOTE: I am assuming these were all attended virtually via computer. I feel that might be easier than the normal way which would be attending these conferences and seminars in person, which would involve travel time as well as the time spent at the various events. This is all part of being an elected representative for which each is receiving remuneration and I would expect all of Council would have attended. During this pandemic, many are working from home including members of Council. There is no way of knowing whether our councillors are actually taking the time to participate on their computers at home.**

QUESTION PERIOD - Mayor Fell had forgotten this preceded other agenda items. No one responded. Ok. Then I will move on to 6.3 Department Reports.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS - Colleen Draper - Be it resolved that January Operating Reports be accepted as information.

Councillor Fuhl - Um just was reviewing the Police Report and noticed that the totals didn't match up with the amounts of the individual lines so I just wanted to make that note. **NOTE: Councillor Fuhl is absolutely correct. If you total the individual described offenses line by line, the differences are as follows:**

OFFENCE	POLICE DEPARTMENT TOTAL	MY LINE BY LINE TOTAL
By-Law	14	1
Manitoba Highway Traffic Act	45	30
Criminal Code of Canada	8	13
Civil	1	1
Mutual Aid	2	6
Transport Trucks	10	0
Conservation Act	1	0
Miscellaneous	0	9
Public Health Act	0	2

Top marks for the graphics and presentation but unfortunately seemingly not accurate. Totals also do not agree. This report is titled December 26, 2020 to January 25, 2021. I checked back on previous reports and found that these totals appear at the end of the January 19, 2021, December 1, 2020, and November 3, 2020 Police Reports which all have the same totals as this one at the end which, when counting the individual items, do not agree with the total of the individual items. Mayor Fell - So I have a question regarding us getting a Police Department Report. Is that not a report that should be going to the Police Board and then if we have questions, like I'm not sure even if we had questions on this, like where would we go from here. I just want to follow Provincial Legislation, that's all. **NOTE: Right from the Police Board Policy and Procedure Manual: A police board will work with the police chief...to establish annual priorities and objectives for the police service, ...it will establish effective policies for the effective management of the police service...acts as a liaison between the community and the police service. The RM of Springfield funds both the Police Service and the Police Board. Thus in my opinion both the Council and the Police Board should be aware of the monthly statistics of the service. If Council had questions regarding the report, I would imagine they would consult with the Chief of Police and his staff. Like any other department of the municipality, Police and Fire Departments are required to report to Council and to the public.** Councillor Ralke - I was assuming that this is just for information for us to be looked at. Mayor Fell - Ok so as long as it is just for information purposes. Can we request through the CAO to follow up to get an answer to Councillor Fuhl's question as well. Councillor Fuhl - You can individually count them yourself, just don't take the bottom number as the exact number.

CONSENT AGENDA - Councillor Bredin pointed out that Council really could not take any credit for the Santa visit to Plympton Village for which there was a thank you letter listed in the consent agenda as Council had nothing to do with it. **NOTE: Kudos to Bredin. Obviously he read his agenda material and noticed the fact they were being thanked for something they had no hand in doing. The initiative must have been that of the Fire Department or perhaps someone in Dugald who made the suggestion to them.**

NEW BUSINESS

A ZOOM AMM Eastern District meeting is scheduled for June 7th. and they are looking for any input to the agenda. A resolution was passed to send a Letter of Support to **the Springfield Pathfinders Snowmobile Club**. They are applying for a Federal Grant through Sustainable Communities Program on 50-50 cost share basis for a UTV priced at \$51,200. to help with trail work and wanted a letter of support from the RM.

High Water Bill Adjustment Policy - Be it resolved that Council of the RM of Springfield approve the High Water Bill Adjustment Policy as presented. Councillor Wilson - I did have some questions regarding Section 2(1)(a) on the criteria for applying for this thing um (iii) must not have received a credit in the past under other policies related to high water bills um and I'm wondering what the purpose of that statement is. Does this mean that you only get one shot at an adjustment or credit ever. Um and why is what you may have done in the past got anything to do with what you might be experiencing in the present. I needed some clarification on that and then on the same concern I guess, (iv) the next one down, must not have been convicted of any violations under Municipal By-law 15-11 which is the rates by-law, water rates and you're required to pay. Why is that a requirement if you are having a problem with water volumes that you don't feel are yours and then the final (v) the next one down and this, I've got a concern about the, what I think it means and I've got a concern about how it's written, must not have failed to have responded to a request for a water meter reading for 12 months. Does that mean you must have responded to your water reading requirement uh for all the 12 months. Or you missed uh one.... Mayor Fell - You must have done one in twelve months is how I read it but we can clarify that as well. Councillor Wilson - So you've only responded to one of the bills in the last 12 months? I don't understand that. It's maybe not written for somebody like me but it's also, if you only paid 1 - 3 month bill in the last 12 Mayor Fell - I think I questioned that too and I read it but I think it means you've read the meter at least once in the last 12 months. I don't know if it's specifically relating to bills so could you clarify that? Phil (doesn't identify himself) - Of course Madam Mayor, which section again was that, Councillor Wilson. Mayor Fell - Well, start with the first one. Councillor Wilson - Well, there all in 2 (1) (a). Mayor Fell - So 2 (1) (a) iii You must not have received a credit in the past under other policies related to high water bills. Phil - So the intent for that, why that's in, to prevent the frequent use of this policy. Mayor Fell - So when one has frequent problems that are legitimate ... Phil - Um we're hoping that we don't get to that point. If they have frequent problems, there's probably something more that they need to be doing from their end. Again when we talk about the readings, if something happens between the street and the meter, there's no way we would have known or been able to tell them there was an issue. What he is saying is that once it has gone through the meter, the homeowner is responsible for the bill although if there is some extenuating circumstances, they are willing to look at it and if it is something for which the RM is responsible, they will adjust but anything from the meter to the house is the responsibility of the homeowner. Mayor Fell says what if the first time it was their issue and the second time it was our issue. This wouldn't allow them to make that claim. Phil - Said they would review the claim based on its merits. The only thing that could fail from the RM side is the meter itself. Anything past the meter would be the homeowner's responsibility. Mayor Fell is not sure if she is comfortable with the way that is worded because "stranger things have happened". Councillor Wilson - Thinks it should be re-worded such as "it may not be acted on if they've received a credit in the past year" or something to that effect. Giving the staff the latitude ...it does need to be re-worded so that if you have a couple of different things going on, that there is potential for redress. Mayor Fell asked if this has been an issue doing multiple claims. Phil - No but just wants a policy to fall back on should it happen. Mayor Fell - I think it is the right of the resident to make claims (request adjustments). Councillor Ralke is just wondering if there should be a time period. I think it is just to avoid multiple claims. Thinks it should be discussed and considered and feels the Water Department would do that. Wants wording other than "not in a lifetime". Colleen Draper suggested that if that clause were taken out, history shows that the ability to dispute a bill has always been a possibility and a review committee could make the decision. Councillor Ralke felt it should have enough "teeth" to prohibit repeat offenders. Mayor Fell put discussion on hold as it was time for the first delegation. Pointed out Ms. Nylen's delegation was "for information purposes" and Council would hear what she had to say.

DELEGATION

NOTE: Before this delegation began, Mayor Fell announced there would be no discussion but that Council would hear what she had to say.

Jan Nylen - Madame Chair and Council: You are likely not surprised to see me before you about this topic. I have been an active ratepayer on effective and fair representation for a number of Ward Boundary By-laws over a number of years. In fact one of you up to 2 ½ years ago had

been a collaborator of mine in most of these efforts. I would like to start this presentation by stating clearly that my primary interest in scrutinizing and questioning prior ward boundary by-laws, and now this current by-law is regards to how modifications were reached as to the number of Wards was reached and their proposed configuration. This allows for a **clearer understanding of the processes used and opportunity to determine if the decisions and recommended changes are based on factual information that will lead to a fair and transparent election (under municipal statute) for Springfield's next local government.** I have looked back over the discussions, reports, and ward statistics and various options discussed in 2018 and prior. I would like to quote from the CAO 2018-01 report to Council (on which 4 of you served). *"While there are variations as to how wards can be drawn up, to be successful over time there is a need to respect a set of established principles that are used nationally in setting ward or riding boundaries. The basic goal is the achievement of effective representation. All "communities" must be provided effective representation in any representative government. Effective representation is composed of a series of factors. In summary, he cited items such as geography, community history, minority representation, communities of interest, physical and natural boundaries, population size, area to be represented and good government need to be incorporated. These varied items are not straight forward and can, at times, conflict. Hence, the approach of finding the appropriate balance."* I am clearly in favour of changing the current ward boundaries of which have for years now not allowed for the requisite **approximately equal number of residents in each ward criteria** particularly for Oakbank residents in Ward 2. Why I am here today is because I would like to know why Council after investing time and effort in a review process of the Ward system seem now to be missing out a key step in completing a transparent and public engagement process: i.e. an opportunity to review various configurations of a 4 ward system. I had hoped maybe naively that there would be a public presentation that identified the ward committee's objectives, methodology, survey outcomes and then laid out various 4 ward boundary options for further public review and feedback. But according to today's agenda Council is showing that it is set to give 2nd. and 3rd. reading to By-law 20-23 without any further community feedback. Why this abrupt change in what had appeared to be an improvement in engaging public during a boundary review process. There is no urgency to passing this by-law at this meeting, in fact not even during this year in the midst of a pandemic. The deadline for it to be passed is April of 2022. It is ironic to me to see in the Clipper where you give notice of Third Reading for By-law #20-23 that the municipality is also advertising a Virtual Town Hall for the Fire Department for February 4 and a virtual conversation on the Budget on February I think it's 11th. I might be wrong on that date. Why not hold a review on the Ward Boundary By-law and hear from the community on that. Such a presentation could add further insight as well as opportunity to discuss ward boundaries as a means to effective representation. It could include for example the results of the surveys, how the surveys were communicated, what was considered a sufficient sampling, how population statistics were calculated, how population statistics relate to previous boundary studies, have building permits and projected growth patterns taken into account etc. Most important for me would be what other boundary configurations were considered because I'm very concerned with the current proposal and would need more information to think that this is the best option for Springfield for the next election but certainly not for subsequent ones. As I mentioned earlier, more than half of you were present at the Municipal Board Hearing for By-Law 18-05, the last by-law passed in regards to ward boundaries. I would like to remind you and then draw attention to the two newer members of Council what the Municipal Board order said and in the conclusion of it, decision letter and **Board Order**. I quote again **"In addition the Board wishes to underline to the Municipality and Council the importance of ensuring robust and transparent public engagement and communication throughout the process. Doing so would provide residents with an opportunity to provide feedback regarding alternatives and ensure that the Council be provided with the necessary information to make a fully informed decision consistent with the wishes of residents of the Municipality."** I sincerely ask that you consider all that I've said and delay giving third reading to By-law 20-23 until after such time as the public has been given further information and further opportunity to provide relevant feedback to Council in an effort towards achieving a more comprehensive process. My final point is an administrative one and I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the version of By-law No. 20-23 that received First Reading by a resolution 20-528 on December 15th. is not consistent with the By-Law No. 20-23 posted with today's agenda. Although on December 15th. I had suggested an amendment to you, Council did not agree to the change at that time. The By-law before you today includes changes to Item 5 by adding wording rescinding By-Laws No. 01-17 and 09-27. In my opinion this is an unauthorized modification to a by-law going through due process without notation of future intent is not only concerning, it is confusing. Further because I did have all my files out from the previous Municipal Board Hearing, I noted that By-law No. 01-17 has previously been rescinded by By-Law No. 09-27. However By-law No. 01-24 that establishes a 5 Ward system for Springfield has not been rescinded and still exists. You may wish to look into that. Thank you. If you have any questions, or do you require any clarification of my comments? **Mayor Fell** - Nope but we thank you for your delegation. And thank you for taking the time. **NOTE: Mayor Fell speaks on behalf of her entire Council when she answers Ms. Nysten. I did not hear her poll her Council!! I am wondering why at this juncture Councillor Williams did not voice his support of Ms. Nysten's presentation. For many years, and I believe he may still be doing some work, he owned Data Link, a business that dealt with the subject of municipal populations and their distribution.** **Jan Nysten** - Thank you. Would you be considering my request? **Mayor Fell** - Um uh Council considers every request um that comes in uh and again we thank you for taking the time to make a presentation. **NOTE: I NOTICE THAT MAYOR FELL DID NOT ENGAGE IN ANY DIALOGUE WITH MS. NYLEN, MERELY THANKED HER, WHEREAS AT THE END OF OTHER PRESENTATIONS, MS. FELL MAKES AN EFFORT TO SPEAK TO THE PRESENTERS, SOMETIMES EVEN CALLING A 5 MINUTE BREAK AND CHASING AFTER THE PEOPLE DOWN THE FRONT HALL.** I live east of #12 highway. The ward I represented between 2014 and 2018, Ward 4, even then was the largest geographically, bounded on the north by Garven Road, on the south by Richland Road, on the west by Stoneridge Road and on the east by the Brokenhead River. That was enough to cover door to door back then but now, it will be enormous. In fact that is the very reason that when the questionnaire as to ward reduction went out, and the only choices were 2 wards, 4 wards or at large (no wards), I chose none of them but instead wrote "REMAIN THE SAME" on my survey and I know of at least one other household that did the same. That choice was not offered and I ask WHY? Rather than reduce the number of wards, perhaps

consideration should have been given to reconfiguring the existing wards or increasing the wards by one and having 6 councillors and a Reeve. Yes, Reeve. Mayors in rural municipalities have historically always been referred to as Reeves but Madame Fell felt Mayor was more befitting her and had the term changed in our municipality. **IN MY OPINION, I WOULD HAVE PREFERRED RECONFIGURING THE EXISTING WARDS TO MANIPULATE THE POPULATION NUMBERS.** Ward 5 could have been moved further eastward and its northern boundary moved a little farther south perhaps, Ward 2 (Oakbank) could have taken in the town only, Wards 3 and 1 could have absorbed part of Ward 5 (the northern part) and part of Ward 3 respectively to even out the numbers. I believe it could have been done without my having the actual population numbers in hand. In any case reduction should never have been considered, rather an increase. If your population has increased significantly, why would one contemplate a decrease in representation. Myself, I thought 5 councillors and a reeve were sufficient and appropriate. This reduction has been imposed on us by Mayor Fell and I say that because most of her Council remain silent or any who protest are quickly stifled by her worship. In short, we do not have a Council, we have a dictatorship as far as I am concerned. But hang on to your hats, this lady's career aspirations politically are upward....she may be running in the next Provincial election and participating in decisions at an even higher level if the electorate sees fit.

Springfield Tache Weed District Re: 2021 Budget - Dave Audette, Chair - Introduced Todd Whitlow, newest Weed Supervisor replacing Claude Roeland. No request for increase in budget in spite of increased costs. They feel they can work within the budget. **Todd Whitlow** - Recently returned to the Province and moved to Springfield. The Cattail Control Program he now refers to as the Drainage Assistance Program. Lots of uncertainty insofar as future. Went through a report he gave to Council detailing accomplishments of the past. "Shooting for a 2 to 3 year rotation in terms of control". Wants plan regarding drainage to be less reactive and more proactive. **Dave Audette** - Mentioned they are less the decision makers and work closely with Public Works and the RM who lead the decision making. Who should Todd talk to in Public Works about proactive planning rather than reactive control. He feels that is less effective. They would like to do a review of the area this Spring to enable them to formulate an improved plan of weed control in road allowances. **Mayor Fell** - "We've never been able to have you in a delegation before". **NOTE: Springfield Tache Weed District has always had the opportunity to address Council. In fact, at least one member of Council sits on that board or committee or whatever it is termed. Mayor Fell would do well to review her agenda items in advance before she speaks.** **Councillor Ralke** - I think there was just one question as to whether we wanted to continue with cattail spraying or is it something that the RM is actively involved in and do they think it is a problem and if they do think it's a problem to what degree are we willing to support it. I think it was kind of a combined effort. **I do sit on the Committee** so that's why those were kind of a few questions that I was kind of coming to Council with saying, "Do we want to do this? Is it a problem?" and to hear from somebody if it's Public Works or whoever if it's a problem or do we stick with it? If not, then let us know. **NOTE: So now we know. Ralke sits on that Committee. One wonders at her ignorance of the subject in light of that revelation. Road allowances have to be maintained to ensure free flowing drainage. Those adjacent to municipal roads are the responsibility of municipalities but in recent times, the Province offloaded their responsibility for those on Provincial Trunk highways to the municipalities as well. No point in digging canals and letting them fill up with foliage! COMMON SENSE!** **Councillor Fuhl** - So I sit on this committee. **NOTE: More revelation! Speaking without unmuting himself!** Just understanding your area ... **Mayor Fell** - Glen, are you unmuted? I'm getting a lot of ear slapping from here. **Councillor Fuhl** - Ya, sorry about that. Um just again under the understanding that I do hear from residents that they would want this weed control and in certain areas and I'm kind of looking at the map going...I see a few areas that aren't being done that were recommended back when I was on the Board and I feel that I'll put that to Public Works and uh so they have that information. **Mayor Fell** will have someone from the relevant department get in touch with these fellows so they will know who is the correct contact. **NOTE: During this presentation, which is far less important than reduction of wards which really amounts to reduction of representation, Mayor Fell allows all sorts of participation from herself and Council or at least the Deputy Mayor and Councillor Fuhl while there was absolutely no commentary allowed when Ms. Nylen concluded her presentation. Clearly accountability is optional when it comes to Mayor Fell.**

High Water Bill Adjustment Policy (resumed) - Mayor Fell - So it looks like there's going to ..and we are going to be asking for some amendments so maybe we just need to put this back to Committee of the Whole to address those three things cause I don't think we can do a reading on it today without seeing the final copies cause there is a few amendments. Other than Rick's 3, is there any other comments people had so we can have Phillip note them and then next week we can see his discussions ..some revisions. **NOTE: Wow. She is giving "Phil" 4 whole working days and a weekend to work on the policy.** **Councillor Williams** - I couldn't locate it but I thought I had read somewhere that when a repair has been undertaken by the property owner, they have to supply evidence so would that not in fact be consulted if they come back for a second credit? **NOTE: Yes, does the Water and Waste Department not maintain records of the individual properties they service if there are problems?** I see Phillip has gone. **Colleen Draper, CAO** - You can find that at 2.2(b). **Mayor Fell** - 2.2? Phillip's not back? **Colleen Draper, CAO** - Yes. **Mayor Fell** - So does Council want to be...uh finished this now even though Phillip is going to have to make some amendments or do we just put it back on to Committee of the Whole? **Councillor Ralke** - And as long as anybody puts forward any of their questions that they have so that we know what it is that he's going to be bringing back or what we're going to be discussing ??? **Mayor Fell** - Ya if you could through the CAO let us know any concerns that you have based on this discussion...so Rick you have those three. If you could put those in an e-mail to Phillip and the CAO and the rest of Council, then we'll discuss that next week on the Committee of the Whole. **Colleen Draper, CAO** - Maybe I could quickly clarify that 2.1(a) the v must have or must not have failed to respond. I think that's when Public Works has actually gone to the house, put a door knocker, said we need to come and inspect, you know if they're claiming a faulty meter or something, we'll put a door knocker on there if they don't respond and we continue going back and they're not allowed into the house, that's when that clause would um take effect. **DEFERRED** **NOTE: There is no reference to the RM's \$11,900. Rapid Leak Correlator purchased in**

the fall of 2018. It would be capable of pinpointing where the leak is. This should negate any disagreements as to who is responsible for the payment of the water usage and repairs.

By-Law 20-23 Decrease Council and Revise Wards - Mayor Fell - Before we go on to the Ward Boundary readings, I thought I would ask, now we have gone out to the public multiple times um, made statements that have been in the media, have been on our web site, so I believe the process we went through was very, very transparent and very clear with the public but I thought I would ask our CAO if she could explain the process and then I will ask Councillor Ralke who is on the Committee to add any additional information and then Councillor Wilson and Councillor Williams, nope Councillor Fuhl and Councillor Williams were also so if they have an additional comments to add they can add those as well and I will wrap up that conversation and then we'll move on to the by-law readings because um we want to make sure that information is out there even though it's been put in print, maybe somebody missed it so we'll just reiterate it at this meeting. Council seemed to be in agreement. **Colleen Draper** - And then hopefully Jan can hear. I don't see her on the screen so....there was a Council Committee ummm formed and so we did meet and there was also staff on that Committee and we worked with our GIS (Geographic Information System) Consultant as well. Um what we had the consultant do was take census data um and put that on to our municipal map uh and then we also took our assessment data cause there was clearly areas in the census that we saw the data was incorrect um so areas that we knew there was heavy populations, Hutterite Colonies, the Dugald Estates, Kin Place, those kind of um places that have multiple residents, we actually inputted the actual assessment data. Uh there was areas that we...you know, census was saying there was 20 houses and when you know you went to assessment there was actually only 5. So a lot of that was corrected manually into our mapping system and that allowed us to actually ..move the boundary lines and see real time populations. So that was kind of the biggest concern we had heard from the public was that our populations were not um consistent in the ward. Uh the Committee worked very hard to come up with options, Ward 2 unfortunately made it very difficult cause there was no way to have equal population wards without splitting Ward 2 into two. For sure though we came up with multiple options for the Ward 4 um and then the Committee decided on one to put forward that made the most sense for us. So that was the process that was followed um and then obviously we went out to the public with 2 surveys, one looking at At Large, Two Wards, or Four Wards uh and then also well at first whether to Decrease, Increase uh Council numbers. **NOTE: Yes, Madame CAO, there was no choice to leave it as 5 Wards and a Reeve. She makes no reference to factoring in the major anticipated housing developments.** So that's the process the Committee took. Councillor Ralke, did you have anything to add to that. Maybe you could give a little bit of talk about surveys and what we put out in the paper as well. **Councillor Ralke** - Yes, we definitely did cover which I know I was a passionate person about that and I know I did take the time to convince other Council members that it was necessary because I did feel that public engagement here was of tantamount need because of the uh, how do you say, um the coverage so that you have fair representation um and that's why we went to the public, that's why we had this group come together, that's why we had multiple discussions and that's why I felt it was important that everybody have some input and the opportunity to give us "your two cents worth" on what you wanted to do. Um I know in discussing the boundaries we tried every imaginable angle you could think of, we sat here for hours on end trying to come up with different angles to include this town but split that town and not have all towns with one boundary and one ward so it's not like we just inadvertently ??? just kind of come up with something and said well that was what it was, we tried every opportunity we could but we had mass population hubs that determined our boundaries, otherwise we like it or not. And it's next to impossible to try to make one boundary and then have a gap in the middle and then say these people are going to be part of that one, it's just not logistically ??? correct so I guess I just want to assure everyone um that we did do our due diligence. We did go to the public, we did work very hard at putting something together that would be less detrimental to the largest amount of people and yes, I know Ward 4 is miles and miles and miles, ten times bigger than other wards but it's unfortunate that's where your rural, development versus urban so I feel that we definitely worked very hard at making it happen and I can't thank Colleen and that group that came to us 2 (to) 3 times to come to these conclusions. **NOTE: The question marks are mine because I feel either the words being used are out of context or I simply have trouble understanding what Councillor Ralke is trying to say.** **Councillor Williams** - Um we just heard it from Janet Nylen. We've also heard it via a copy from an e-mail to the Municipal Board from another resident. They were not privy to the alternate configurations of the ward boundaries and I think that's what they're concern is. There wasn't enough transparency in the whole thing. And I believe the Committee came up with the right ward scenario and we put that out to the public to comment on through a survey but what they're saying is that there's not enough consultation because they didn't see the other um configurations and I remember back in a previous Municipal Board Appeal Hearing on Ward Boundaries that there was a number of configurations that the Board asked for to uh for the consultant who did the Ward Boundary scenarios to explain. And at that point the uh Municipal Board made a decision on one of the alternates that wasn't proposed by the Municipality so we may have to provide it at some point anyway. **Councillor Fuhl** - Ya, I just like to add that we definitely had spent many hours on this and tried to come up with the best solution. Um as the CAO Colleen had mentioned that Ward 2, it was very difficult. We had to come up with the right solutions the best we could to work with Ward 2 and have the populations in the accurate amount of each ward. **Mayor Fell** - Then hastened to say she wasn't on the Committee, she delegated others, and thanked them for "the great job" and then reiterated the various ways they had advised the public, on line, in the paper, the web site, surveys etc. so "this process has been extremely um transparent". **NOTE: Clearly the Mayor is immersed in her "alternate reality" and prefers to avoid the truth. The process was anything but transparent.** Of course the residents across Springfield all have different opinions....but we can only end up with one system. **NOTE: Who made the decision that because the population of Springfield had increased, particularly in two of the urban development sites, it WAS A WISE DECISION TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF COUNCIL MEMBERS????? THE PUBLIC WAS NOT GIVEN THE CHOICE OF LEAVING COUNCIL THE WAY IT WAS OR INCREASING THE NUMBER OF WARDS AND THEREFORE COUNCILLORS. The public was not given those choices!!!!** So that's where we are with the results that we heard um so we are going to move forward. I hope that clears

up any um concern we had with the process. All this, again, all this had been mentioned before in previous committee meetings or council meetings and in the newspapers as well and this Council did make a commitment um to work on this as soon as they could after the election and we've been working as hard as we can during COVID to "keep our words for what we told the public" in regards to ward boundaries. **NOTE: Janet Nylen clearly stated the lack of public engagement that was confirmed by Councillor Williams. It is abundantly clear that Mayor Fell is not interested in the need for public input.** *Be it resolved that Second Reading be given to By-Law No. 20-23 being a by-law of the RM of Springfield to reduce the number of councillors and establish a revised ward system for the purpose of electing municipal councillors as amended. CARRIED 6-0* *Be it resolved that Third Reading be given to By-Law No. 20-23 being a by-law of the RM of Springfield to reduce the number of councillors and establish a revised ward system for the purpose of electing municipal councillors as amended. CARRIED 6-0*

Councillor Wilson - I was just wondering about the comment that our delegate made, Ms. Nylen, about By-Law 01-24. **NOTE: It is unfortunate that Councillor Wilson chose to focus on logistics after third reading rather than speaking to the more crucial issue of reduction of wards during the by-law discussion.** **Mayor Fell** - Ok so I asked the CAO about this. She called the Province and spoke to them about the wording, she spoke to them about the previous By-laws we had so everything that is here she actually had dialogue with the proper Provincial representatives and got confirmation this is the process we should be using moving forward. **Colleen Draper** - So I think the main concern at the beginning was that um even though Council had given third reading to those previous by-laws that the Municipal Board had deemed them not sufficient I guess is the word they used. When I did speak with the Province they actually made a comment to me that I found interesting that the Municipal Board is a recommendation and does not have to be accepted by Council um so I did add those extra by-laws in there um honestly I can't comment on the 01-24 right now, I'd have to look it up and my computer is being silly on me right now. Um ya apologies I can't comment on the 01-24 if that was a by-law that we had missed. Um if we want to add that in as a part of the amendment we can do that as well. **Councillor Wilson** thought that was a good idea and then they could vote on the amended by-law or pass a by-law rescinding that by-law..... **Mayor Fell** - Well maybe what she can do instead of us saying that this is what we need to do, she can confirm with the Province if that's their recommendation to add it in and then if that is the recommendation, then she can come forward to Council and let us know the steps to take but I think she needs to confirm that with the Province. **Colleen Draper** - Ya I just want to confirm I would assume that 01-24 has been rescinded by one of those previous by-laws already so there would be no point in having it added on here as well but...you know I honestly wasn't going to add the extra ones after the comment from the Province because she said as long as Council's giving 3rd Reading to those By-laws, those By-laws have basically been rescinded already so to put them on here is duplication and wasn't required but I added them on because I know that was a concern that was brought and I just thought this would cover all of that. Council concurred. **Councillor Wilson** - I have no problem with our CAO just finalizing that and if by any chance there is any kind of an issue that arises, I'm sure she'll bring it to our attention. **NOTE: Janet Nylen went to a lot of trouble to lend her expertise to the discussion of ward boundaries. She has 30 plus years of experience in the municipal field and her presentation was "blown aside" by the Mayor and she was denied any opportunity to discuss this issue with the remainder of Council.**

Springfield Centre Playground Project - *Be it resolved that the Municipality of Springfield formally apply for funding from the Sustainable Communities Program to defray project costs for the Springfield Centre Playground with a budget of \$300,000.* **Councillor Wilson** - My approach to this is this project appears premature at this time and I believe there are higher priority Rec and uh and Active Transportation priorities in front of us um and so therefore to me this does not appear to be in keeping with a "hold the line" budget in times of COVID. **Councillor Ralke** - I must admit when I first read this I was kind of going, like, "What???" Where? And then I finally read it through and it said that it would be right close to this area here I think from what I can tell and all I can tell you is when COVID hit its worse and these poor kids and families didn't have anything to do, this skate park was full. There were cars parked down the road. They were parked in our parking lot. They were parked everywhere and all the kids had their masks on, there were swarms coming here every day so if you could actually benefit families to have that playground ...I know I appear emotional...because I could not believe how many people were here and participating and being community minded at a time where things are lost...you're losing everything...and it's the only free thing families will have to do. They have the skate park. Kids have to get their minds off some of the worse times of their lives. HOOOO Sorry. So if this playground can do this for them and give them that little bit of hope...please let's support this and let's move forward and I know money is really important and I know it can be put to different things and thank god we already have some trails and paths and pathways that are already established um within our community already. We have that Trans Canada Trail ...everybody's using it...everybody's finding ways to get out and to do and cope and to get through this and like they've said, 20-21 probably won't be much better so if the government's actually looking to share this cost with us, I think it would be remiss on our part not to take advantage of it and um do that little extra for our community. **NOTE: A few observations on Councillor Ralke's diatribe (prolonged discourse).** 1) Kids didn't have anything to do??? - the skate park was full...long line of cars....swarms...HOW WAS SOCIAL DISTANCING BEING MAINTAINED? WHY DID PARENTS HAVE TO DRIVE THEIR KIDS TWO BLOCKS OR SO WHEN THEY HAD SKATE BOARDS? 2) If the parents are losing everything....AND THEY MIGHT WELL BE INCLUDING THEIR JOBS WHICH PAYS THEIR TAXES AMONG OTHER THINGS...and Council is suggesting adding to their tax burden by putting \$300,000. into another recreation project, a WANT, not a NEED. 3) She could not believe how many people were here...AGAIN IF IT WAS BEING THAT WELL USED, HOW WAS SOCIAL DISTANCING BEING MAINTAINED BY THE USERS OF THE SKATE PARK..while their parents were patiently waiting in their cars for their children to wear themselves out. 4) Kids have to get their minds off some of the worse times of their lives...I submit "kids" of this era have not had any bad times yet...no wars, no famine, no cataclysmic environmental disasters...that might yet be to come, especially as parents are using "fossil fuel" vehicles to drive their kids 2 or 3 blocks to skate. I used to walk over a mile to school every day. My parents did not yet have a car. It was walk or bus and transit bus was too expensive. 5) How does Councillor Ralke come to know that the Trans Canada

Trail is being used by everybody? Has she been out walking on it? I doubt she walks to Council meetings down Springfield Road. 6) Where does she take those "acting" lessons? I might like to hone my skills and offer my services as a "senior" extra in some local productions.

Mayor Fell - I would just like to reiterate and I look at COVID a bit differently, it's completely tied parent's hands, they can't take them to anything indoor so outdoor amenities are, that's what parents want. You can't..you need to give your kids an outdoor activity, you need to keep them engaged, that's what we have right now and I think it's very forward thinking on the behalf of staff to take our current pandemic into consideration and apply for a grant for this and to see outside, that'll be all ages of children playing there .. **NOTE: That their parents are driving them to....in the case of Mayor Fell probably her husband or mother driving what remains at home of their own 10 children and their two fosters....**that's a fantastic thing for Springfield so I support it 100%. **Councillor Wilson** - I support your intent and spirit and I also support Councillor Ralke's comments. I would just like to point out to Council that we have in the past few years um completed major renovations, complete new playgrounds in a few of the areas within Oakbank. **NOTE: It has been my observation over the years that children, given any circumstance, have no trouble making their own fun, with or without any facilities.** I would also like to point out that when the skate park was over at the Oakbank Arena, several times I found children using the steps of the Administration Building as their skate park. Further even after the park had been built, I found boys with skate boards using the steps of the Administration Building, short distance from the \$400,000. plus skate park constructed for that purpose. **CARRIED 5-1**

Cooks Creek Communications and Security Upgrade - *Be it resolved that the Council of the Municipality of Springfield approve \$6,025.03 from the Cooks Creek Community Club maintenance reserve account for communications and security upgrade project.* **CARRIED 6-0**

Red River North Trail Membership - *Be it resolved that the 20/21 membership in Red River North Trail in the amount of \$320 be approved.* **CARRIED 6-0**

Trails Manitoba Grant Program - Colleen Draper - According to the report um I know Public Works had put forward an Active Trails report and two of the priorities on there we are wanting to apply for Trails Manitoba grants. So the one trail would be Springfield Road 206 to the skate park and then also Almey from Main Street to Silverbirch and this is 2-1 funding so the maximum grant amount is \$75,000. so the Municipality must provide \$150,000. We're proposing a project budget of \$225,000. **Councillor Williams** - Did we cover a Letter of Support request from Springfield Pathfinders? **Mayor Fell** - Yes we did. **NOTE: I did not comment on it.** **Colleen Draper** - Sorry I need to do some housekeeping here. We don't have a mover and a seconder for the Trails Manitoba Grant Program. *Wilson/Fuhl - Be it resolved that the Municipality of Springfield formally apply for funding to the Trails Manitoba Grant Program for two new proposed pathways up to a project budget of \$225,000.* **CARRIED 6-0**

COUNCIL THEN WENT IN CAMERA, RETURNED, AND ADJOURNED. **NOTE: In Camera sessions should be in the minority, not the majority. Council should not be conducting business In Camera. The items legislatively allowed for In Camera are very few, including Personnel Matters, Negotiations to which public knowledge could be a detriment, Legal issues.**