

May 13, 2026 Springfield Public Meeting

Selected Candidate Statements & Public Exchanges

Councillors Mark Miller and Andy Kuczynski - Anola

Purpose. This report presents selected substantive passages involving 2026 municipal candidates Georgina Mustard, Jill Overall, Margaret Marion-Aikins, Mark Miller and Andy Kuczynski, together with the Adam Rossell mailer/development exchange. The selections follow the meeting sequence and retain enough surrounding wording to show the substance of the statement or exchange.

Transcript note. Quoted wording is reproduced from the supplied Tactiq transcript. Timestamps are omitted for readability. The automated transcript contains recognition errors in names and terminology; this report does not silently rewrite those words. Editorial headings and context notes are not part of the transcript.

Source. Tactiq transcript: "Public Meeting by Springfield Councillors Miller and Kuczynski (Sio, Taxes, Recall)," May 13, 2026. The full chronological transcript remains the primary source.

1. Georgina Mustard

Context: Mustard opens the first presentation, thanks Miller and Kuczynski, discusses Sio Silica and later turns to council and election-related statements.

Um, thank you for attending tonight and thank you to Mark and Andy for hosting. I'd also like to give a special thanks to Mark and Andy. **They said no to SEO early on in their application process and never wavered.** They stood up and fought against CEO Silica when other when many others did not. Once again, my name is Georgina Mustard. I lived in Springfield for 30 years. In that time, my husband and I have raised eight children. Our kids are now the fourth generation living on the same property. Around 2016, a company called Can White Sands, now known as Seoila, came into our community. They were sharing information and talking about setting up a large-scale silicon manufacturing facility right behind us. It wasn't until June of 2020 that I heard more about this company. A group of passionate people had set up an Anola with a petition against the project. Four years later, I learned about the potential threat to our drinking water. The same water our families and livestock rely on every day. What worried me most about Sorry. What worried me most was that no representative from this company had ever reached out to contact us. That silence spoke volumes. Later that same day, I met with people from our community and reporters from CTV News. I saw for the first time a pile of silica sand uncovered and blowing in the breeze. I couldn't believe it. Silica sander blowing in the air is is a significant health risk when particles are inhaled deep in the lungs. It can cause long-term serious diseases like silicosis and lung cancer. Seioilica was ne negligent in keeping these silicone sand piles properly covered up. If cioilica doesn't cover them up now, how can we trust they will properly cover them up in the future? From that moment forward, my journey began. Attending meetings, going to rallies, and speaking at Clean Environment Commission and municipal board hearings. I wanted to assist and do my part. In the summer of 2020 2023, I spent countless evenings going door to door with a petition helping people understand what this project really meant. It wasn't just about my family or my well. It could affect over a 100,000 Manitobans who rely on the same groundwater system. And that work hasn't stopped. Even now, we are going doortodoor, not just talking, but listening. Residents are sharing real concerns about CEO potentially moving forward, especially the cost tied to the water treatment and wastewater infrastructure. People are asking important questions and many people feel those questions are being left unanswered. In Ward 4, there's growing frustration about the absence of their counselor during such a critical time. Because of that, conversations are already turning towards the next election. Residents are saying clearly when candidates come to their doors, they will be asking where they stand and how they plan to support the people who live there. If our drink drinking water is

compromised, what options are we left with? We can't hook up to a city supply. Our farmers would lose their water for crops and animals. The land could collapse from hollow cavities left behind after mining. Our property values would plummet. Why would we risk that? This drilling method has never been done anywhere else in the world. Without clean water, our land would be useless, and we can't live without water. It's a basic necessity that means everything. In February 2024, the environment minister Tracy Schmidt rejected CEO's application for an environmental license. The decision was based on the serious environmental risk the project posed, especially the danger to our drinking water and the fact that the company's instru extraction method was new and unproven. If this project had gone ahead, we would have lost our rural identity as we know it. There would have been noise, light pollution, and the loss of our existing wildlife. One of my f family's favorite pastimes is sitting around a bonfire, enjoying each other's company, looking up at the stars, and counting the shooting stars and satellites. I want to protect that simple joy for generations to come. Now, don't get me wrong. I didn't do this all by myself. I'd like to say there's kind of an army of us from Springfield, Reynolds, Taché, and beyond. I want to thank the Springfield taxpayers group, my friends, neighbors, and everyone who stood up and lent their voice. And also our line in the sand.

2. Jill Overall

Context: Overall's presentation addresses taxes, infrastructure, municipal debt, spending and the approaching municipal election. The following passages preserve her principal claims and her concluding election-related statement.

>> All right. My name is Jill Overall. I've been a longtime resident in Springfield for 35 years. So, we all know that life is good here in Springfield with our country living, our close proximity to the city, the activities we offer, both young and our older citizens, and up until now, our lower tax rates. That's why we all moved here or we chose to stay here if we were lucky enough to grow up here. So, our communities are growing and with growth comes the need for more infrastructure and new infrastructure means new developments. Currently, I believe that our council are planning too many big projects all at once and it's skyrocketing our debt and which in turn skyrockets our tax bills at this moment. We are currently paying only \$7 million in debt off. That's what we're taxed on. But **these new projects that the mayor wants to go ahead with will put us at least \$80 million in debt.** Yeah,

>> So, that's more than 10 times the amount of debt. So, apparently the new water and sewer system that the mayor wants to go forward with for new developments in Oakbank and Dooall would be the third or fourth largest in the province. I googled the list of towns in our province and in order of population and I found that Oakbank is only the 15th largest town and Dold doesn't even register in the top 80.

>> So we're going to have a third or fourth largest system. So what developments do we want? I think most people are here are receptive to new growth in our area, encouraging our communities to grow with new people coming in and encourage us to become prosperous, offering all kinds of opportunities. However, we are the ones who live here now and so it's our community, so we should have a say in how it's developed and that means we should also have some input in how our taxes are spent within the municipality. So, I'm the first to tell you that I'm not an accountant, but I'm fairly intelligent and I understand the importance of paying off my mortgage and my loans in a timely manner. So, in Springfield, we have a number of new projects in the books that our mayor and council have decided that we absolutely need. So, I'm thinking that the price tag on many of those projects is going to be backbreaking from for some of our friends and our neighbors. So, I'll explain my thinking. So twothirds of our residents both on rural properties as well as within our towns were all on wells. If you live on an acreage, you all have put in your own wells, your own septic fields, all the systems that go with it, and those are pricey. The municipality hasn't helped you out at all. They don't help us finance that kind of stuff. However, in the towns of Doo and Oakbank, our mayor and a couple counselors, not these two, are planning on financing not only the \$52.5 million sewage lagoon, but the \$29 million water system, which they call Dows, Doug Oakbank water system.

They've secured some grants for the Dows, but after we add other planned projects like a new aerial fire truck and phase one of our new rec center, we're looking at spending north of \$80 million on projects. So in the new developments in Oakbank and Dold, the normal project, sorry, the normal practice is that developers will pay a good portion of the cost of installing the water lines to new homes, but that cost is paid to the RM only after each lot is sold. Once the lot sells, the developer will pay back a portion to the municipality, us, the taxpayers, to offset the cost of the water lines. But the big problem with the DAO system is it's being developed on such a huge scale to service 200 homes a year for 20 years. I did that math and that's 4,000 new homes. Sorry. So, so 200 new homes, 20 years, 4,000 homes. So, that number seems quite incredible because as of now, yearly sales of new building lots in our area have averaged less than about 50 new homes a year. And not only that, we still currently have approximately 400 service lots that sit vacant and are for sale, no buyers. So that means the taxpayer is expected to front the cost of a water system for 4,000 new homes immediately with a realistic payback of only about 50 homes a year. So if we follow historic building patterns, I'm not even sure that number pays off the accrued interest that we're going to have. So now as a non-accountant again, I'm feeling that the number of millings that our mayor is putting out there are extremely scary numbers. So, I've attended all three community information meetings that the RM has offered this year. The first one was at the open house, the openhouse meeting in February where residents could attend and ask questions about pretty much anything to the RM operations. Very quickly, the majority of questions that night focused on projects and the taxes attached to each of those projects. At one point in the night when it was confirmed that yes, we will be over \$80 million in debt to fund these projects, there was an audible gasp heard throughout the crowd. But then the chief financial officer, his name is Amaran. He then came to the mic to let us know that that was okay because he actually had the authority to take us up to \$120 million in debt. So you could hear a pin drop and then people started chatting to their neighbors. Let me remind you that we are currently only in debt seven less than \$7 million. So even as a non-accountant, I totally understand the implications of this massive debt. I was hoping that at some point we might be able to build phase two of the rec center and get that indoor soccer pitch and the new arena. Or maybe we could think about other projects that would enhance our lives. If we get ourselves in a hundred million of debt, we are going to be limited to new projects or even any new projects. And I know some of you are sitting there and you're gamblers and you're thinking, if we get those 4,000 new houses, we might have more people to add to our tax base. Yeah, but what if that gamble doesn't pay off? What if we only sell those 50 lots? We would be so far out on a limb if we pay for that. So that leaves us taxpayers paying off the loans for the new Dow system, do Oak Bank water system with development costs only being paid back to the taxpayer after the lot is sold. I would call that a huge gamble on the part of our council, putting that on our backs. We taxpayers are left to pay off the borrowing costs as well as the interest on these huge loans that the RM plans to borrow to cover that new water system. But if house bills stall, then we, the existing taxpayers, will be left to pay all those loans back as well as the interest with no guarantee from those developers. Seems like a risky gamble. I've been hearing from many people that they're not just angry about the current increase in taxes this past year, but some are worried that they won't be able to keep up in the future. So, we've already established that I'm not an accountant, but I do know that the longer you advertise your loans, the more interest you're going to be paying. And we are set to pay those loans off for 20 years. No matter how the mayor and the CFO spin these numbers, they are inescapably huge. My lifetime will be spent paying for these loans, and I'll have a lot less expendable cash after I pay my taxes. So, I would sure like to slow down our spending and look at downsizing the DAO system. The plan has been looked at by at least three independent engineers who do say that it's the third or fourth largest system. Maybe we don't need to set up to service 4,000 new homes all at once. And then maybe we could afford to build phase two of the rec center, have money for other new projects. I would also like the mayor and counselors to be more careful with my hard-earned tax dollars. A good example of careful spending would be the money that we're paying out to lawyers for frivolous court cases. So, not only the one that we had last year or last week with the four residents um who were fighting to have recorded uh recorded meetings. But another good example is the money we're paying out. Uh the first time we

spent money on unnecessary court costs was when the mayor decided that counselors Miller and Kazinski should not hold town hall meetings without his permission.

>> So we taxpayers actually spent \$25,000 so that the mayor could send that message. And last week, I'm sure you read in the paper the court case of our council versus the four residents who took a stand on videotaping. The four citizens case was taken up by the Justice Center for Constitutional Freedoms at no cost. The same justice organization has recently represented another municipality in Canada successfully. So, precedent has been set. But incredibly, our mayor is pushing forward with this case as well, wasting thousands of dollars, possibly up to a hundred,000 in lawyer costs.

>> Another big expense that we are going to be incurring is a new aerial ladder truck for our fire department. Our current fire trucks can fight fires that are three stories high, but three stories doesn't fit in with the highdensity neighborhood that WMR, the Winnipeg Metro Region, were pushing us towards. And if you remember, we just got out of the WMR. Four of our counselors voted against it, but our mayor wanted to still be in it. He voted he wanted to stay in. So even though we finally did withdraw from WMR, I believe we were starting to plan for that high density living. I mean really, we live in an area where land is plenty. Why would we start building upwards when we could just build outwards? So we started building upwards for things like the new assisted living building. That decision will cost us \$3.5 million for a new fire truck that can reach more than four more than three floors. And fun fact, we will be only the second municipality in Manitoba that will have an aerial fire truck. So, I'd like to encourage our mayor and council to rethink this massive spending and this huge tax load. **How about leaving some of these decisions to a fresh set of eyes, a fresh set of counselors after this fall's election, which is only five months from now?** Thank you.

3. Margaret Marion-Aikins

Context: Marion-Aikins speaks immediately after Overall. Her presentation is framed around stewardship, public money, trust and municipal decision-making.

>> Okay. Want to thank Andy and Mark for having this wonderful open house. And it is so wonderful to see all you people out tonight. It's, you know, especially when it's so lovely outside. Anyways, um um I want to start with something that I believe we all understand and my topic is stewardship. and how that relates to us. A steward of a taxpayers's dollars is someone entrusted to manage public funds responsibly, fiscally, and ethically. A good steward means treating taxpayers money with the same care you treat your own. And ensuring that the public money is used for good and not waste. That's the standard. That's what we expect from our municipal council. And really, that's what this meeting is all about. Because this conversation is not just about projects or growth or even taxes. **It's about trust.** who is making the right decisions on our behalf or whether those decisions reflect the kind of care and responsibility we expect. But first of all, let's let's remember who we are. We're Springfielders and Springfield has always been a rural municipality at its core. On the average, 70 plus percent of residents live on acreage, farms, or ranches. Springfield was the first RM to incorporate back in 1873. We are 450 square miles of massive land and 70% of it is open country. We also, fun fact, have 500 miles of gravel roads. Now, we chose this way of life. We've invested in our infrastructure, our wells, our septic fields, and maintain our own properties. We accept few services from the RM. And because of that balance, we pay less taxes. In return, whoops. In return, we built a strong community. A community where neighbors know each other, where people step up when it matters, and where families have deep generational roots. Myself, as Carolyn said, I have four generations of my family currently living here. Now, I know Georgina, you beat me five, but now let's talk about what's changing. We are seeing a level of spending and rapid expansion of small lot high density construction that is unprecedented in our history. major infrastructure, roads, growing services, and the projected increase, as Jill mentioned, in the debt of our \$7 million deficit to over \$80 million. This is unbelievable. In the 150 years, our municipality, we have never had this kind of debt burden. This debt burden will not only affect us but generations to come. And here's why that matters. In the rural municipality, it's all about balance between rural and urban. That's generally 70% rural, 30% urban. This balance is there for a reason. Rural residents have historically asked for less

and therefore pay less property taxes because they require less services than the towns than Oak Bank than Dold and then Anola. But when this balance starts to shift and we've become 50% rural and 50% urban, the cost structure changes. And those costs don't disappear, they shift onto us, the taxpayer. The Canadian Federation of Municipalities estimate that for every dollar we spend, it costs a \$1.28 to maintain and service those residents. That 28% is paid by rural residents, which is a large part of our annual property taxes. And this is in addition to what we will be paying on the \$80 million of debt that our present council except for our two gentlemen here plan to put us into. We are already seeing the signs of pressure, higher property taxes, more sus, more strain on households and people quietly struggling to keep up keep ends meeting especially seniors, people on fixed incomes and working families trying to man manage raising costs. Now let's take a step back and look at the bigger picture. If we continue down this path of rapid small development and we continue shifting away from the balance of 70% rural and 30% urban, consequences will become quite clear. There will be more financial burden and pressure put on residents, more dependence, on support systems for the seniors, fixed income and growing families to make their ends meet. And over time, it will become harder and harder for our families, our friends, and our neighbors to be able to live to afford to live in this municipality. Now, let me be clear. This is not about stopping growth. It's about managing it. Springfield has a development plan bylaw, which lays out growth in a measured, reasonable, and substantiable manner, sustainable, excuse me. The mayor and some councils counselors have ignored this bylaw and now it's time to get back to basics and follow the development plan. Growth is good and especially in the rural area. Why? Because rural residents pay for their own infrastructure. So growth needs to have a greater focus in our rural area. Because growth without balance, without affordability comes at a cost. And the cost is being felt by people who live here right now. So we have to ask, are we growing in a way that is sustainable? Are we maintaining tax fairness between rural and urban needs? Are we making decisions that people can actually afford to live with? Because at the end of the day, this comes back to stewardship. Again, a steward of taxpayer dollars is entrusted to manage public funds responsibly, fiscally, and ethically. To treat the money in the same way you would treat your own. To ensure that it is put to good public use, to speak with and approve with the residents a comprehensive plan that is sustainable and reasonable property tax requirements. That's what the standard should be. And I don't think it's too much to ask for because this is just not about budgets and poor planning. It's about, like I said, trust. It's about fairness. And it's about whether the people who built this municipality will be able to continue to afford to live in one of the best communities in Manitoba. Because stewardship matters to us. It is everything and the people who built this community should never be priced out of it. So let me let's move forward. Together we can make a difference. But let's do it with balance, with care, communication, and trust. and without the responsibility of good governance that this community deserves. Thank you.

4. Mark Miller

Context: Miller responds during the stewardship discussion and later speaks about campaigning, recall, political promises, debt, spending and development.

>> Thank you very much for your question. I just want to make it uh plain and clear as kind of what was said. Andy and I are two against three usually. So anything we do is kind of in the back uh thrown to the wall. Annie and I voted against this last budget about 3 weeks ago because we believe that it was overt taxing the residents of our community. Now, being on council for three and a half years, I've seen such atrocious waste, it would make you sick to your stomach from council retreats outside our municipality. In other words, not supporting our local enterprises, but going out to the White Shell to spend money in the White Shell for frivolous things overnight, catering, everything else to trees to trees. So, in front of the municipality, the office there, there's one tree that's worth \$3,000. What? And I said to the CEO, "Are you kidding me? Deian and I just did a whole whack of pine trees and we paid \$200 for a similar type of tree. So, government tends to spend your money like it's going out of style. I'm tired of that kind of nonsense. It's atrocious. It's wrong. And Annie and I will continue to fight. One other thing, I know this is nickel and dime. I know this is nickel and dime, but Andy and I

commute to meetings. We share the costs for going to wherever it might be. It might be Selkerk. Tomorrow happens to be Selkerk. I know it's nickel and dime, but we're the cheapest on council because we don't go to all the golf tournaments that you pay for some of these other people counselors to go to.

>> So no trust and honesty. I'll call a spade a spade. It's not the time. It's not. There's probably very good candidates for mayor. I have one vote on council as a I have one vote on council as a counselor or a mayor so I can still advocate for fiscal prudence, environmental responsibility and protection and a whole host of other things. I don't want to campaign here because you know if the mayor was here, he said, "Mark, you're campaigning." So, I won't. But anyway, thank you to both of you.

>> And uh there's also donations. So to rent the hall, to um set up signs, all cost money if we any donations are appreciated. I'm going to flip it over to Mark and Andy after that as questions from the public. We're just arm wrestling. Who's going to start on this one? So, we've got an interesting proposition for residents and for voters. And I like it. I'm a graduate of political science. So, I'd like to ensure that the residents have control not only at the ballot box, but between elections. And this is something that would have had an integral difference in our community this last these last three years. For instance, when Andy and I campaigned last election, I didn't know him from a hole in the ground. The first opportunity to meet him was basically election night. So, I didn't know what I was getting into. And I actually I actually believed some of the politicians who were going around doortodoor saying they were against silica fiscal management and on and on it went. Then we realized very quickly that when Andy and I voted against the development agreement for Socrilica that three other people weren't on the same page as us. But yet I think Andy, I don't think you have it here today and I don't want to lambast people, but you have to put some trust in a politician when they say things to you and present it in literature at your door because that will yield that'll yield a vote potentially. For instance, if I said doortodoor that I was against Scioilica and then I voted for it, you should lynch me literally.

>> You know, that didn't happen here. So we want to introduce something that is not uh a milestone but something that's used in other jurisdictions and we we will do a lot of research on this but it's called recall legislation between

>> **so if a politician if a politician misleads you**

>> **quite frankly lies**

>> **then you ought to have the right to hold them accountable** through either uh I guess uh petitions a a a significant amount of politic polit or I guess um nominations uh signatures would be required to remove that person. Now, this is in place, as you know, in Alberta. They're struggling with it a little bit because it's new and they don't know how best to implement it. But if we can take that model and either commit to it and or have some other model, modify it to Springfield's needs, then maybe we can make this work. But what I'm telling you is that Andy and you're going to speak too. I am committed absolutely if and Dian my wife knows I'm running in the next election that if I lie present something wrongful in my literature and I vote opposite of what I committed to at the door and in the literature, you ought to kick me in the butt. Get me out of here. And you have the right to do it between elections, not just four years down the path where you can make a lot of damage. Let me tell you, there's if this is true, we're \$7 million in debt and that spikes to 60, 50, \$80 million, that's on your backs. Andy and I voted against those things. In social media, they say, "Andy and Mark, they're always against stuff. They're always against stuff." That's not entirely true. We're against frivolous spending. We're against uh reckless um expenditures putting us in debt for generations to come. We believe in growth. Absolutely. Adam Rossell, you're a developer. You know how important growth is. You want to develop uh Google to potentially almost double the size in combination with the other developers. Maybe that's not a bad thing, but you ought to take on your share of the infrastructure cost. It shouldn't be the rap peers here who do that.

5. Adam Rossell - Mailer/Flyer Exchange

Context: Rossell identifies himself, asks whether the hosts knew the mailer/flyer was going out, raises alleged misinformation, and is interrupted while attempting to identify an example. The sequence below is retained so the question, responses and handling of the exchange can be read together.

>> question.

>> You're already shutting me down before I can even speak.

>> Okay. I guess I I do have a couple questions and just a couple comments. And for everybody that doesn't know who I am, I'm Adam Rossell. I'm a representative of REI LCO. We have our 117 acre mixeduse subdivision just happening in D there. Um with that being said, I do have a few questions regarding I guess just this mailer and this flyer. Um, were you guys aware that this was going out prior to the meeting or anything along those lines?

>> Your names are all written in your faces as well. So,

>> yeah, that's I'm not a member of the Springfield Taxpayer Rights Corporation. So, they do stuff independently just like any organization any organization can. Yeah.

>> So, um you would have to talk to the representatives who who represent that organization. Were we aware we we were made aware because I I believe if I remember right **they asked our permission if they could use uh um our faces and things like that.**

>> For sure. Yeah. No, that's appreciated. And are you aware that **your faces and names, contact information are I guess technically related to some misinformation that's actually out there and on this pamphlet itself.**

>> Okay. Can you question?

>> Did you misinformation?

>> **There's some misinformation on here.** Yes. And who who who create the misinformation?

>> That's a great question.

>> Do you have do you have do you have proof to it that it's misinformation?

>> Well, I mean, for instance, there's

>> you you stating now you can say you want to answer speak. I I would love to speak because it's an open forum. I'm a taxpayer in this community as well, right? So, I think we all have that opportunity to speak on an open forum and I think that we can all agree. I've always been very respectful. Okay, for instance, there are

>> for instance there is you in this pamphlet people are stating that there are unallocated and no reus left over for development for future expansion projects. **That is a blatant misinformation.** You know what? It's four pages. There's a lot of information.

>> Okay. If I may.

>> So, hang on.

>> We'll just step back a bit.

>> So, we'll you can find where you're stating that because you can't just state it and then

>> keep on going.

>> Okay. We're going to go on. So you can find that and then we'll come back up.

>> Okay.

>> Our last question.

>> I just want to clarify things too.

>> When when everybody all the speakers are done because the speakers are all here on the schedule. When the speakers are done, the mics are open for the rest of the night. So people can ask whatever questions they they want or appreciate. So thank you.

6. Mark Miller / Adam Rossell - Development and Infrastructure Exchange

Context: After Miller addresses development costs and directly names Rossell, Rossell is invited to respond. The transcript then records a dispute about the literature, developer infrastructure costs and who bears off-site costs.

>> **then you ought to have the right to hold them accountable** through either uh I guess uh petitions a a a significant amount of politic polit or I guess um nominations uh signatures would be required to remove that person. Now, this is in place, as you know, in Alberta. They're struggling with it a little bit because it's new and they don't know how best to implement it. But if we can take that model and either commit to it and or have some other model, modify it to Springfield's needs, then maybe we can make this work. But what I'm telling you is that Andy and you're going to speak too. I am committed absolutely if and Dian my wife knows I'm running in the next election that if I lie present something wrongful in my literature and I vote opposite of what I committed to at the door and in the literature, you ought to kick me in the butt. Get me out of here. And you have the right to do it between elections, not just four years down the path where you can make a lot of damage. Let me tell you, there's if this is true, we're \$7 million in debt and that spikes to 60, 50, \$80 million, that's on your backs. Andy and I voted against those things. In social media, they say, "Andy and Mark, they're always against stuff. They're always against stuff." That's not entirely true. We're against frivolous spending. We're against uh reckless um expenditures putting us in debt for generations to come. We believe in growth. Absolutely. Adam Rossell, you're a developer. You know how important growth is. You want to develop uh Google to potentially almost double the size in combination with the other developers. Maybe that's not a bad thing, but you ought to take on your share of the infrastructure cost. It shouldn't be the rap peers here who do that.

>> Absolutely. **I believe in open dialogue.** I know uh Jill, you might uh get Well, no, I won't say, but Adam, please respond to that, but but give us truth, honesty, and integrity. Like,

>> you'd like the exact same. What What did I misrepresent?

>> Then he has to pay for his car. Look, I don't want to get into a back and forth or anything along those lines, I would like to just have a mature open conversation. Um, just on my previous point quickly because I was asked to do

9. Mark Miller / Adam Rossell — continued exchange

>> Absolutely. **I believe in open dialogue.** I know uh Jill, you might uh get Well, no, I won't say, but Adam, please respond to that, but but give us truth, honesty, and integrity. Like,

>> you'd like the exact same. What What did I misrepresent?

>> Then he has to pay for his car. Look, I don't want to get into a back and forth or anything along those lines, I would like to just have a mature open conversation. Um, just on my previous point quickly because I was asked to do it. On the very first page right here, it does say, and I quote, "Sufficient water capacity exists." text tax text tax text tax reus unallocated

>> case in point okay

>> where's your question

>> what's your question

>> from one developer to another

>> okay well I'll answer

>> okay so my name is

>> and I'm part of the creator of that literature uh in my past life I was with high qual manufacturing but I was also a developer And our last development was in RM Tache, which was 1352 residences. And we paid for all our off-site services that were not covered by government grants. Those REU Those RAUs were developed by or proofed

>> So as why I came back up here to to Yes, sir. So, specifically looking at our project in Doug, it's roughly 116 acres, it's divided into 15 acres of commercial space, duplexes, some affordability options, including uh some rental space as well as condos. Now, out of the 116 acres, I agree everyone needs to pay their fair share. >> I was I was leading to that, please. >> I I will. So my answer to that because I was asked an answer not question is that we have roughly speaking about a \$25 million infrastructure budget. Okay. So as RDI Landco we have to front the \$25 million in order to put the pipes in the ground in order to put the fiber optics the street signs sod etc. We have to hold on to that for a 2year warranty period. Okay. So, in that 2-year warranty period, if something goes wrong, we as developers have to pay for it, >> right? >> Once it passes that 2-year warranty period, that \$25 million worth of infrastructure, which is an asset to the community, an asset to the RM, an asset to the tax base, we then have to donate that to the RM >> alongside our 20 acres of open and green space. And so, that's almost 20% of our entire land mass. So to answer your question, we also have to come up with an additional \$20,000 round numbers, \$20,000 as a levy fee on a per door basis. So it's not just donating the \$25 million worth of infrastructure. It's also coming up with \$20,000 on a per door basis >> once you sell the lots. >> You know, I don't I don't exactly know that rate this second, but regardless. Okay, hold on, please. Regardless, it changes on by municipality. So, >> I wasn't asking the question. I was asked to rebutt the conversation. Okay. >> So, now I'm >> disagree. You want to hold a public meeting? >> We've held three public meetings regarding our development. >> Good. Your development, but not the cost of the taxpayer. >> Right. Why would I get into a business deal where it's going to cost me more money than I can make? >> You didn't get into it to lose money. You got into it to make money. >> That's exactly right. >> Great payers here. >> Well, there's two discrepancies here, Richard. And that is what what Brussels are telling you is what happens within the boundaries, the lot lines of their property. And it's the same for any developer in Manitoba, anywhere in Manitoba. That's the standard. >> But it's all the plumbing coming to it is being paid by the municipality. >> And that's us. >> And that doesn't happen in every other municipality. And in tache, as I said, we paid for every off-site cost that was not from funds available from grants from the province. >> And that's the way it should be. We should not be paying for services that is developerdriven. >> That's it. >> It's okay to invest in cash, but not in Springfield. >> Well, I'm retired. Well, I've also had open heart surgery and cancer. >> So, what's your point? >> So, when you when you develop property, it's where you have it. I own the golf course with my wife and in u Lorette and there was the opportunity to create uh development there in Lorette and we we did that until I had to retire out because of help. We're trying to build affordable housing. >> Affordable housing is another word for high density. >> Affordable. >> We're not paying for your off-site services to the tune of 70 or 80 million bucks. >> We're not here to argue. >> Thank you. >> Not here. >> Thank Thanks. Thanks for your input.

7. Andy Kuczynski

Context: Kuczynski follows the recall discussion with his own statement about trust, resignation, recall and representation.

>> thank you. Yeah, talking about recall. Um, I agree everything that Mark said to to the residents here and I will add to it that I don't think so I need Rico. **If I will break your trust, I will resign myself.**

>> Why should I be on the council when I don't represent you? Everybody should have same principle because because **if you break the trust once to people you never regain nobody going to trust you anymore** and that's the the main reason that the recall it's okay but you know as

community decided we're going to go back to community and we're going to ask you you know write petitions maybe have a referendum on it and if if community agree to it then we going to go to AMM and we're going to present it to make the resolution. I don't know if it going to pass and then from resolution from AMM that

Context continuation: Kuczynski continues from trust and recall into the proposed process, promises, municipal projects, borrowing and taxation. The transcript wording is retained.

>> I don't know if it going to pass and then from resolution from AMM that association of municipal municipalities have to go to province and maybe province have to approve it. if it's going to happen. So that's going to be very lengthy process.

>> But what we should do, **we should elect the right people who can be trusted**, right?

>> **Whatever they promise to you, they keep the, you know, the promise to people**

>> and don't spend the money. Now I'm going to tell you what's happening. Um two projects like treatment.

>> So this two project going to cost us 20 \$52 million. So we received from province 19 million in grants. So there is left \$33 million. So now from this 33 million we're going to be borrowing \$19 million for those two project. So we have 40 minutes left. 40 million that was drawn from the taxpayers.

>> Now if if somebody somebody went to the municipality and received this financial plan from presentation and that was done April 15, 2026 and here state um how how we how we been taxed. So we have in 2023 we have reassessment year and 2025 we have reassessment year. So in 2023 our taxes went up 17.7% in our community. That's a lot of huge amount of money. In 2025 our uh assessment and taxes went up 18.9%. So that's 35% more in taxes our community is paying to the municipality.

Reading this record

These are selected transcript passages, not findings about whether any underlying factual claim is true or false. The selections are intended to make the candidates' recorded statements and the Rossell exchange readable in sequence. For any disputed wording or transcription error, the underlying recording should control.

Meeting Format and Closing Exchange — Carolyn White / Edwin Giesbrecht

The first excerpt records moderator Carolyn White's earlier description of the meeting format. The second excerpt preserves the later White-Giesbrecht exchange through the close of the meeting. Wording below follows the supplied Tactiq transcript, including apparent recognition errors.

Earlier Meeting-Format Statement

Carolyn White / Moderator: So tonight's goal is to hear presentations from our speakers, our counselors, and an opportunity for your questions. Uh here's the format. So we have we'll have a two speakers then a four to five about four to five audience questions at the at the mic. Then two more speakers four or five more questions. Then we'll hand it over to Mark and Andy. They'll have things to say and then more questions after that. **So there's lots of opportunity for questions. We ask for questions of any kind. No restrictions.** Please come to the mic over there. That's our mic. If you would rather, you can also text your question to the number up there, 2047916270. And Allan is going to um either read it out or give it to me to read. We ask that when you come up to the mic to state your name and your question. We appreciate a follow-up question after the counselor's or speaker response to your question. We welcome that.

Closing White-Giesbrecht Exchange

Carolyn White / Moderator: Uh, Mr. Mr. Gber, do you have a question?

Edwin Giesbrecht: Well, I I came I came prepared um with three dissertations uh in respect to SC um your taxes and the um recall act. And uh if you'd afford me uh that ability to share that with the community here, I would be uh pleased to do so.

Carolyn White / Moderator: **What's a dissertation? You're looking at questions.**

Edwin Giesbrecht: It'sa it's a formal address as to the topics here. I'm very accustomed to Patrick Sarion denying me, deferring me, uh not allowing me delegations, dissertations. So I would I was hoping that we would be open here.

Carolyn White / Moderator: **You have to keep it short and then listen to your question.**

Edwin Giesbrecht: Okay. Tell you what, I'll just deal with one, you know, rather than cuz I've got I had a 53page report that went into on analysis uh to council on our taxes on the last 10 years and they are not publishing that PDFs for the public to see. So, I'm going to stop there on that. Sc I've got quite a bit on

Unidentified / transcript: SC.

Edwin Giesbrecht: I'm going to deal with the recall.

Edwin Giesbrecht: regarding the recall act. I have here a document dated September 22nd, 2025.

Edwin Giesbrecht: That is and I have there the very first and original founding framework materials for the Manitoba Municipal Recall Act that I advanced on the public record as of September 22nd, 2025, including the executive brief, preamble, legislative summary, and draft bill structure. What a municipal recall framework ultimately does is restore an additional layer of democratic accountability between elections. It recognizes that the public trust is not something elected officials simply borrow for four years without responsibility to the people who place them there. A properly structured recall system creates a lawful balanced and carefully safeguarded mechanism allowing residents to respond in rare circumstances where they believe trust represent representation or accountability.

Carolyn White / Moderator: **Sorry, question.**

Edwin Giesbrecht: Uh thank you for the individuals that did sign my nomination for mayor. I will be registering tomorrow fulfilling that promise already to you. I thank you very kindly ladies and gentlemen.

Carolyn White / Moderator: Thanks Edwin. Anyone else have a question?

Meeting close: All right with that we thank everyone for coming. We appreciate your time. We appreciate all your comments and feedback. If you have any questions, you can stay back and talk to us individually. Have a good night. Please drive safe.

Source note: This section records what the supplied transcript captures. It does not add a claim that the moderator physically took or grabbed the microphone, and it does not insert audience applause, because those actions are not expressly recorded in the transcript text.