

Tudor Dinca responses
Candidate for Calgary City Council Ward 5

1. Will you oppose privatization of municipal services and infrastructure, including Public-Private-Partnerships aka P3s? Will you support bringing previously privatized services in-house?

For the most part, I am against the privatization of municipal services and infrastructure, however, if there are situations or particular services/projects that the city simply doesn't have the capacity/experience to execute, then City Hall should look at the private sector for solutions/alternatives. Although I do believe that the public sector, especially in a large city, can deliver on most public services/projects that doesn't mean there shouldn't be any room for potential privatization. This flawed black & white approach presented in your question leaves us with less options not more and if we look around the world there have been positive and negative examples. Here is a good analysis from the Alberta side (this is a 2019 article - <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/edmonton/p3s-coming-back-to-alberta-1.5141318>)

A even better analysis comes from the European Union : <https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eca/special-reports/ppp-9-2018/en/> ; If you give this a read, you will see the common sense point that, P3s will only be successful in countries that have strong legal frameworks and a considerable administrative capacity. So again, as I said above, the preferred method is to go first with the public sector when it comes to services and infrastructure projects but to say completely "NO" to any private sector delivery for either would be shallow and/or close minded.

2. Will you support your employees and your community by ensuring the municipality employs staff with living wages, full-time hours where desired, job security, and collective bargaining rights?

Living Wages (YES - without a doubt) ;

Full-time hours where desired (Not sure what you mean by desired, desired why who? The employee? The employer? I think we should ensure full-time hours where needed. I must mention that I do not like the practice of hiring more people part-time instead of a good number of full-time workers in order to avoid having to pay them benefits, I am very much against this practice) ;

Job Security (YES - without a doubt ; We need a fair and reasonable criteria to ensure that the worker's rights are protected while making clear the expectations that come with those positions);

Collective bargaining rights (YES - workers should have the instruments by which they can voice their opinions and negotiate as a group) ;

3. Will you oppose attempts from the provincial government to legislate against municipal staff including cuts to the Local Authorities Pension Plan, or restrictions on their right to

strike?

I don't know enough about the Local Authorities Pension Plan to understand why the province would make such cuts. If you could provide me with that information I would be more than happy to read it up. I have read about the LAPP's relationship with AIMco and I am not too crazy about the idea that AIMco is legislated by the province to be its mandatory investment manager. (<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/lapp-aimco-losses-1.5597638>)

I am also against restricting the right to strike, the only exception to this would be when our country/province/city is under a state of emergency.

4. How do you propose your municipality deal with funding shortfalls, cuts, and downloading of responsibilities from federal and provincial governments? Do you favour spending cuts over tax increases?

When it comes to downloading the responsibilities, cuts and shortfalls from the federal/provincial governments we have to make sure we keep these other levels of government honest and make it clear that if the City has to tackle issues such as homelessnes or affordable housing (to name a few) we need the financing from the provincial and federal levels in order to do so. We have to contribute to the education of every Calgarian so that they understand what a local responsibility is and what a provincial/federal responsibility is. A city, simply can't do everything by itself.

I am not a tax first type of candidate or elected official (if I am to be elected). We have to take a look at area by area and see where we need to maintain, decrease or increase funding in order to get the best value for our residents/taxpayers.

5. Do you support measures such as mask mandates, vaccine “passports”, and vaccine mandates for staff to limit and reduce the spread of COVID-19 in your municipality?

For the mask mandates, it really depends on our hospitalizations/ICU numbers, if the system is stretched to its limit then yes, I would be in favor of them. For vaccine "passports" as with the mask mandates it depends on the numbers but I would make the point that these vaccine passports could only restrict access to non-essential services in situations of great stress to the medical system. I AM 100% AGAINST vaccine "passports" for essential services and against their use in public services spaces.

I am very much against vaccine mandates, no person should be forced to take a medical product to which they do not consent to. COVID-19 testing should be made available as an alternative. I will say that the only somewhat reasonable exception to this would be in senior homes and hospitalization spaces due to the significantly higher risks of transmission and death. But having a one-size , fit all policy for the whole of society when it comes to vaccine mandates is nonsensical.

6. Do you support measures to reduce municipal reliance on services fees and fares, such as eliminating transit fares?

Although I like the idea of eliminating transit fares, the reality is that this type of policy only works in medium to small municipalities (500,000 people or less) and even more important than the population size is the municipality's footprint. Calgary has sprawled way too much to ensure free transit for such a large area. However, I have written on my campaign blog about this (<https://tudor4ward5.ca/fare-choices/>) and even made a short clip about this as well (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Uq8Mw4iBzXk&t=12s>). Although I do not think that eliminating transit fares is a sustainable model for a city of our size, I do think that giving riders more options in fares, options that are better value for dollar for the user is a desirable model. Our current model only favors those who rarely use transit or those who use it all the time. As a result we are missing this massive group in the middle that want more options than the single ticket or the monthly ticket. I would rather collect the same amount of revenue from tickets/fares but we would get more people on public transit. Getting more people on transit would reduce stress on roads (which are expensive to fix) and would reduce costs in other areas as well. I think a model that give transit users more choice and better value, is more reasonable than a system that offers free transit (again due to the size of our City).