

Daniel Heikkinen responses
Candidate for Edmonton City Council Ward sipiwiyiniwak

Regarding Privatization: I do support bringing some previously privatized services in house, epcor was once a city owned utility and many people believe that the quality of service has gone down since becoming a private enterprise. I do not know if we can bring them back under control of the city to try and improve the quality of service and if possible reduce the costs to the people (reducing pricing to create savings for people instead of generating profit for shareholders), but it is one that I have my eye on. However I cannot oppose all privatization, at least not in the areas of lawn and snow removal. I believe that it is worth looking into if we can do a hybrid model where public service handles the main roads and highways of snow removal, and that small private landscaping companies handle the snow removal of cul-de-sacs that often don't get as much service during winter. This would improve the safety of those areas, especially as we have the new garbage bin program and with limited space we might see the winter cause major issues for service in numerous residential areas. The guiding light here is what brings the best service to the people, and so it is in that mindset that I cannot say that I am opposed to private enterprise, because there might be a time when it is the best option, and we should be able to have that discussion.

Regarding Municipalities as employers: We should as best as possible try to get people to a living wage, the data we have is from 2019 and that showed us that in Edmonton a wage of \$16.51 was a living wage according to the bissell centres reporting, which isn't that much of a jump from our current minimum wage. With full time hours desired, that depends on current levels of staffing, and whether the job being performed requires full time hours, this would have to be discussed case by case. As far as job security and bargaining rights, it is my understanding that city employees are already unionized, and as such should have those protections, unless this isn't the case.

Funding: We are told as households to manage our debts, to tighten our belts, and to make do. I believe that a city should have the same mindset when the times call for it. We cannot tax people too much, for they will just leave and then we lose the tax base compounding the funding problem. We cannot just cut service because there are numerous people who require the many services provided like transit in order to live their lives. The only way to deal with funding shortfalls from other levels of government, is to create a level of service that is covered by funding by the city, and then to build out the programs slowly so that we do not exceed our capacity. In times when we have federal and provincial funding, we can put that towards extra services, but never lose sight of that basic core service level, so that when times do get tight we do not have to cut or reduce. We should figure out what enough is to create a framework that is robust enough to resist major financial issues.

Covid safety: I believe that this question is regarding jurisdictional responsibility, and no one has been able to show me anything that has allowed the municipalities to take on this

responsibility should the province back away. First we need some form of emergency legislation that the province of Alberta can enact to pass their legislative authority onto the municipalities, so that cities can pass legally enforceable health measures with advice from their health experts. Truthfully though we see that other countries are succeeding and downgrading the threat of covid as a result of frank and open communication between government and the people, which has absolutely been absent in our province. Regarding my own belief on a vaccine passport, that requires more explanation. I am fully vaccinated, and I believe that a combination of mask's, cleanliness and vaccines will reduce the spread and help beat this thing, but I question the validity of a passport for the following reason. The CDC and WHO, who are considered to be unbiased health experts, have both said that even if you are vaccinated you can still get infected, though your symptoms will be lessened. But those people are still potentially vectors for the disease even though they might not feel any symptoms, they are still carriers. To me the need to prove vaccination, while putting people at ease, does not remove the fact that you are still infected and can infect others. A vaccine passport is not proof against you being a threat to others, just potentially less of one. So while I believe in vaccination, and I can say that the side effects of my second shot were not fun to ride out (extreme chills, headaches, lethargy, hard to focus), I don't think I can support the rationale for a vaccine passport with our current information.

Affordability: The answer to this question can be found in funding, which is that we need to sit down and figure out what is needed for a basic level of service that people can agree is good, with whatever metrics we and the transit union (or relevant department union) can agree upon to reflect that. However I think that people need to keep in mind that we have limited funds, and as such if a better system is required, that money has to come from somewhere. If user fees can go towards making improvements on the service as opposed to being it's primary source of funding, then that might be the best compromise, allowing us to lower fees if we cannot remove them unless we are willing to accept a lesser service. Also under this thinking with minor user fees, they would become less of a burden as we move to a higher standard of living wage. Lowering fees, while maintaining a decent level of service while also ensuring that people are making enough to have a livable wage should reduce the financial burden currently being felt.