

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING (COW)**  
**March 23, 2021 1:00 p.m.**

**WITHOUT PREJUDICE (E&OE)**

**NOTE:** I neglected to attach the update on CanWhite Sands that I had said I would with the March 16th. notes so it is attached to these notes instead as well as another one on the subject. Also attached is correspondence regarding a Public Hearing to be held on Monday, May 31st. at 6 p.m. in the Dugald Community Club regarding Ward Boundaries and the proposed reduction to 4 wards from 5. The form to register your concerns to the Municipal Board by May 14th. is attached. **6.1 Public Utility Board Hearing** - Ad placed last page of April 1 Clipper edition for proposed changes to water and waste rates. **Councillor Wilson** - Would like Phil to just go through how charges are arrived at for the quarterly unmetered wastewater rates and unmetered charge for REU. Quick primer. **Phil** - Did not have a direct answer for him at that time. Done based on previous studies over years. Consultants Dave Lyle, Mark Prydun, took some time looking over those particulars.

**NOTE: I would think that given that the agenda is posted in advance of meetings, the Manager of the department should have been prepared to answer questions. Further, Council should not use initials like REU unless they explain what they mean. It means Residential Equivalent Unit.**

**6.2 High Water Bill Adjustment Policy - Councillor Wilson** - I've got a couple of clauses that um I guess the first time we saw this they concerned me and I came up with a suggestion for a better wording and would like to try it out: *2.1 (a) iii There's double negatives and whatnot in there and I thought what we're trying to get at is "must not have received a credit in the past for the time period being claimed for."* **Phil** - So we can certainly amend that. I'm agreeable to whatever changes Council would like to see. **Councillor Wilson** - I think what this clause is trying to say is that the um what I'm thinking is that the clause is trying to say is "must not have received a credit in the past for the time period being claimed for". Is that what you're trying to say and is that a little bit clearer because it says you can't claim if you've ever claimed before. **Mayor Fell** - I think he's saying under a different pol...cause we're changing the policy. **Councillor Ralke**? **Councillor Ralke** - That's what I was picking up when it says received a credit in the past under other policies and then in brackets it says "this policy over the current municipal bylaw" so those are two separate policies so let's say somebody received a credit for a similar or the same situation or problem under the municipal bylaw then said hey that's not enough money I'm getting covered or enough of a rebate or whatever you want to call it and then came at us for our policy and I think I thought or I perceived this iii to be saying that you won't receive a credit if you've applied for one of them. You're not going to get it under both of them. **Mayor Fell** - I also want to clar...ask if we need to clarify that um when it says applicant property type, does that limit them because it's an applicant? What if the worse happens and they live, they've bought a house, it happens, and they move somewhere else and it happened again, would this limit them from that cause **stranger things have happened**? So because it says applicant, should it not say property and instead...should it not be limited to the property? **Councillor Ralke** - ...cause I guess, what are you saying, Mayor? That one person could purchase another home within the same municipality..... **Mayor Fell** - And there could be .... **Councillor Ralke** - ...and within the same water area. **Mayor Fell** - Right. So what if they lived somewhere for a year and then they sell the house and move somewhere else and there happens to be an issue...this because it's per applicant they would not be able to submit again. **Councillor Ralke** - But this is about policy..... **Mayor Fell** - Right but according to the ... cause at 2.1 it says applicant, they cannot apply again if you've already received a credit, well what if you live at a different property. **Councillor Ralke** - ...musing out loud to herself.... **Phil** - So in that particular case I would say ....(and he goes on and on but comes up with "case by case".) **Mayor Fell** - Even people that have multiple rental properties cause I know that's true, it would be the same applicant if one of the rental or two of the rental properties had issues...this would restrict them as well and that may not be the intent but say 10 years down the road um someone may say we can't entertain that because it says it in the policy. **Councillor Ralke** - And I see b. is property so a. is applicant and b. is property under the same number 2.1 so you say move that one down into properties category? **Mayor Fell** - (interrupting) Take applicant off altogether. It should be based on property. **NOTE: I am wondering what happened to the remainder of the Council as this seems to be a private debate between the Mayor and Councillor Ralke.** Because applicants can ...kids can move out of their parent's house, like something could happen where 2 people living separately in separate properties...so what happens if there is problems with the same applicant at a different property ...by this they can't put a claim in again. **Phil** - I would also put a theoretical position that what if someone had multiple properties as a landlord and the same problem came up occurring on multiple properties and there was a pattern where they were just trying to get money out of the RM so we could have various scenarios that occur and again that would be Case by Case which then goes through the request so it would be hard to try and put ...every detail to exclude or include an applicant from the claim short of reviewing the claim for that facility cause we could add more and more layers of information but at what point do we cover everything. **Councillor Wilson** - I think if my suggested wording was placed under property it would solve all those problems. **Phil** - ...and to make it B3 and get it in the last 12 months? **NOTE: Colleen Draper then comes up with something else and more discussion between Fell and Ralke ensues.** **Councillor Wilson** - Colleen, I think my wording is not for the same issue because the issue is high water usage and um so I don't care what the person comes up with as another reason why they should get a ..another cheque ....if you've already got a credit for an adjustment for um some kind of excess water usage in a certain time period, that's it. You've got one claim, one credit and you're done. Doesn't matter if you found another reason why...you already got your credit, you're done. **Councillor Ralke, Colleen and Rick discuss but Mayor Fell doesn't agree with that. Mayor Fell and the rest argue about the time period. Councillor Williams** - The issue is that there may be a water leak because they are neglecting the care of their facility. If they don't take care of it, I think Phil may have identified as in our last discussion that if they don't take care of the problem, it may reoccur and we will provide them with another credit. They need to fix their plumbing. **NOTE: My first observation is that Councillor Wilson seems to have done his due diligence and examined all the materials in**

detail while the remainder of Council simply respond to his comments. They don't seem to have independent positions initially. In my opinion, far too much time is being spent on dicker over one section and the wording. The policy should be sent back for further rewrite and explanation of what each clause is targeting. However, Ralke and Fell and Draper continue on and Fell is expecting a decision to be made right now. I personally disagree. The policy is obviously not clear or all this discussion would not have been required. Councillor Bredin said "he had no firm opinion on it". REALLY. He is the Councillor for Oakbank yet on an issue concerning his constituency, he has "nothing to add". Perhaps he should be labelled NTA or "don't have a problem with that" as he consistently abrogates his responsibility for his own ward and seemingly just follows the lead of the Mayor. Council should not be voting on an unfinished product, one that is not clear and needs rewriting in some facets of the document. It should be redone and come back at another meeting for the vote. Finally Mayor Fell suggested that after much discussion!!!!!!!!!!!! Councillor Wilson - 2.1 (a) v - To me the present reading is problematic. My suggestion is "must have responded to at least one request for a water meter reading in the 12 months including the period in which the leak or the excessive water usage occurred." Councillor Ralke - If the leak occurred and you wouldn't know it occurred until you received your bill after. Councillor Wilson - The point is the individual, the applicant, must have as I understand it, must have responded, must have put in at least one water meter reading in the 12 months either preceding the period or within the period when the leak occurred. Is that what that is trying to say because otherwise..... Mayor Fell - (interrupting) That's exactly how I read it so if you're going to claim there's a problem in October, from October of last year to the current October you better have put in a meter reading ...like it's very clear. Councillor Wilson - If that's the intent, I would suggest rewording that phrase to get rid of the double negative. NOTE: Again more discussion overlapping and Phil did not catch the revision. He threw in that the City of Winnipeg has this template and "they use backwards English so...". Councillor Wilson - The next one is 2.1 (b) i and I really don't understand what's being prohibited here. Are you prohibiting something being unoccupied or more than a 7 day leak. My suggestion is "must not have been left unoccupied and/or vacant for more than 7 consecutive days without the water being shut off at the internal shut off valve during the period the leak occurred or the excess water usage occurred. NOTE: More unnecessary discussion. Councillor Wilson - Finally in 2.2 (C) I just simply suggest that the 2 sentences in that clause be reversed. If you say the Municipality has the right to inspect the repairs and then if the municipality requests access the applicant must comply within 30 days. I think that reads better. COUNCIL AGREED. Councillor Williams - Phil, here is the scenario for you. What if the owner has a pool and all of a sudden they spring a leak which gets diverted into the pool and then they let you know that that bill was legitimate...they had a leak....I'M JUST KIDDING..... NOTE: Did Councillor Williams suddenly wake up in time to make a joke about an issue that concerns his ward? HOW INANE IS THAT? Further more discussion occurred over this minor issue than was spent on the Tervita Hazardous Waste Facility in the Industrial Park. I wish that the Mayor and Council would spend more time on issues of real consequence, not these minor matters!

COUNCIL THEN WENT INTO CLOSED MEETING, RETURNED AND ADJOURNED.