

List of Delegations

Monday, November 16, 2026
9:00 AM

Henry Baker Hall, Main Floor, City Hall

Special City Council
List of Delegations
Monday, November 16, 2026

The List of Delegations is prepared to reflect the agenda as published. The order in which items are considered, and related delegations heard, is subject to change and remains at the call of the Chair.

CR26-123 Discretionary Use – 1102 N Fleet Street

TABLED DELEGATIONS

DE26-98 Charles Brittner, Regina, SK

DE26-99 Dan Devers, Regina, SK

DE26-100 James Elliott, Regina, SK

DE26-101 Mandla Mthembu, Regina, SK

DE26-102 Sean Tucker, Regina, SK

DE26-103 Nathan Kraemer, Regina, SK

DE26-104 Thabo Mthembu, Regina, SK

DE26-105 Nathaniel Cole, Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, Regina, SK

DE26-106 Richard Exner, Unifor 594, Regina, SK

DE26-107 Celeste Pinder, Regina & District Labour Council, Regina, SK

DE26-108 Darin Milo, Regina, SK

DE26-109 Darcy Debert, Canadian Labour Congress, Regina, SK

DE26-110 Mark Simpson, Consumers' Co-operative Refineries Ltd., Regina, SK

TABLED COMMUNICATION

CP26-65 Tanner Vogelgesang, Regina, SK

NEW COMMUNICATION

CP26-75 Lara Tella, Saskatchewan Health Authority – Public Health Regina, Regina, SK

DE26-98

Good afternoon, Mayor and councillors. My name is Charles Brittner. I work at the Co-op Refinery and belong to Unifor Local 594. I am here as a concerned citizen. I am asking you to refuse this application today.

*

Councillors,

Public office is a public trust and Public safety IS part of this decision.

Section 1E.3.5 of Regina's Zoning Bylaw 2019-19, sets out the criteria for reviewing a discretionary-use application.

Paragraph D, subparagraph six, expressly includes:

"any other matter(s) affecting public health and safety."

That is part of the City's own test for this application.

At the October 20 Planning Commission meeting, there was considerable discussion about which responsibilities belong to the province.

I accept that provincial authorities enforce provincial workplace-safety requirements as mentioned by City administration.

But Council is deciding whether this location is suitable for the permitting of residential accommodation.

Provincial responsibilities do not remove the public-safety criteria from the City zoning bylaw 2019-19.

**

For example, In April, Administration assessed a proposed daycare beside SARCAN at 5100 Parliament Avenue. It considered the neighbouring industrial operation, loading bays, separation and fencing before approving it. The risks differ, but the principle is the same: the City must consider how surrounding industrial activity affects people occupying a new development.

The City Identified specific protective measures for the daycare and made fencing and conformity with the proposed plans conditions of approval.

***

I acknowledge that CRC submitted an engineer's summary.

The 2019 CRC work camp received a permit under accessory-use rules. After the labour dispute, Council changed the bylaw to require discretionary approval for camps of this size—the review you are conducting today.

In my opinion, that change was not for show.

The question before you is whether that summary, together with the other information presented, adequately supports the decision you are being asked to make.

For example, on October 20th when the Commission asked about evacuation arrangements for the camp, CRC indicated that these would be addressed during “final detailed planning”. That answer did not demonstrate how people living or sleeping at this location would safely evacuate during a refinery emergency. It left that important question for later. Later permits do not, by themselves, establish that this location is suitable for people to live.

****

CRC also described buses and other vehicles being available . But having transportation available does not, by itself, establish that evacuation will be safe.

Gasoline and diesel engines can become ignition sources where flammable gases or vapours are present. A release could also affect the routes people need to use.

The evidence presented has not demonstrated to me how occupants would be protected if moving vehicles themselves were unsafe, an exit route were affected, or people needed to remain sheltered.

CRC does have an existing emergency-response system.

My concern is that the camp-specific arrangements relied upon to support this location were described as work still to be completed.

Describing the camp as temporary does not resolve these concerns.

*****

I also want to address the labour context directly.

The City says collective bargaining concerns are outside its discretionary-use review. Please understand that I acknowledge and respect that position. My request for refusal rests on whether this application adequately satisfies the planning criteria.

The camp cannot proceed without City approval. By approving it, Council would enable accommodation that could support CRC’s operations during a labour disruption. Calling the process neutral does not change the consequences of a yes vote. The fact is, a no vote is the only truly neutral choice: it preserves the existing situation rather than strengthen one side’s position in a labour dispute, and thus, adding a 3rd party dynamic to the bargaining process.

******

People staying in this camp would be residents as well as workers. They would sleep, eat and spend their off-duty hours at the refinery. Contrary to CRCs comments on the 20th, familiarity with refinery operations does not establish that the location is suitable for accommodation. Council needs to assess it as a place to live, not simply a place to work.

An Administration recommendation deserves consideration. It does not replace your judgment.

Taken together, the information presented leaves important questions unanswered about whether the proposed protections are adequate for people living at this location.

That is why I am asking you to refuse this application, today.
****
Promises are not plans, and reassurance is not evidence. Approval should follow the answers—not come before them. This application has not met the City's zoning bylaw test. Councillors, the decision is yours, and so is the responsibility. Please refuse this application.

Public office is a public trust.

Sources supporting this submission
The Regina Zoning Bylaw, 2019 — Bylaw No. 2019-19, Chapter 1
Section 1B.1, page 1.2: the bylaw's purpose includes residents' health, safety and general welfare.
Section 1E.3.5(d)(vi), page 1.17: discretionary-use review includes "any other matter(s) affecting public health and safety."
Section 1E.3.9, pages 1.18–1.19: Council's decision-making options, including refusal.
https://www.regina.ca/export/sites/Regina.ca/bylaws-permits-licences/bylaws/.galleries/pdfs/Zoning-Bylaw-2019-Chapter-1-Authority-and-Administration.pdf
Discretionary Use — 5100 Parliament Avenue, application PL202600009
Administration's report dated April 2, 2026, with approval dated April 10, 2026.
Page 3 discusses the neighbouring SARCAN operation, loading-bay location, fencing and separation. Page 5 specifies approval conditions, including conformity with plans showing play-area fencing and landscaping. Page 6 records the approval.
https://www.regina.ca/export/sites/Regina.ca/business-development/land-property-development/.galleries/pdfs/Proposed-Development/PL202600009-Record-of-Decision.pdf
Council report CR26-123 — Discretionary Use – 1102 N Fleet Street, October 28, 2026
The two-page Council report forwards Planning Commission's recommendation to approve the camp, subject to five conditions. The package includes the original Administration report RPC26-20 and its supporting appendices.
https://reginafiles.blob.core.windows.net/media/council/2026-10-28%20City%20Council%20-%20Full%20Agenda-5695.pdf
Administration report RPC26-20 — Discretionary Use – 1102 N Fleet Street, October 20, 2026

Report page 4, October 20 agenda PDF page 28: approval of the previous camp under accessory-use provisions and subsequent changes to work-camp regulations.
Report page 5, agenda PDF page 29: Administration's safety rationale, emergency-response arrangements, Regina Fire's reported comments and reliance on the quantitative risk-assessment summary.
Appendix B, agenda PDF pages 37–39: public concerns and Administration's responses, including its position on collective bargaining considerations.
Appendix C, agenda PDF pages 40–41: submitted quantitative risk-assessment summary material.
https://www.regina.ca/export/sites/Regina.ca/city-government/city-council/council-meetings/.galleries/pdfs/2026-10-20-Regina-Planning-Commission-Full-Agenda-5688.pdf
Regina Planning Commission meeting recording — October 20, 2026
1:28:19–1:28:35: discussion of buses being available on site around the clock and other vehicles available for transportation.
Approximately 2:15:00–2:15:08: discussion of camp evacuation arrangements as part of final detailed planning.
2:48:13–2:48:37: Administration's explanation concerning the full risk assessment and reliance on an engineer-signed summary.
3:02:46–3:03:13: confirmation that further permits, code compliance and inspections would follow before occupancy.
Timestamps refer to the original meeting. References were checked against the displayed transcript in the supplied recording. Select the October 20 Planning Commission video on this page:
https://www.regina.ca/city-government/city-council/council-meetings/agendas-and-meeting-documents/
Occupational Safety and Health Administration — Internal Combustion Engines as Ignition Sources
Pages 1–2 explain how gasoline and diesel engines, including vehicle engines, can ignite flammable gases or vapours.

Charles Brittner

https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/osha3589.pdf

DE26-99

Statement of Concern from Retired Refinery Workers Opposing the 510-Bed Work Camp

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am here today carrying the voices of many retired men and women who spent their careers at the Co-op Refinery — people who worked the units, maintained the equipment, trained new generations, and lived through the last lockout.

These retirees may no longer punch a clock, but they still care deeply about the Refinery, about the workers who are there today, and about the community that surrounds it. Their experience gives them a perspective that cannot be ignored.

And from that perspective, they are deeply concerned about the proposed 510-bed work camp.

Retirees Remember What a Lockout Does to Families and the City

Those who lived through the last lockout remember it vividly:

- the strain on families
- the division in the community
- the uncertainty about the future
- the fear of losing livelihoods
- the long months of tension and hardship

Retired workers watched their friends and former coworkers stand on picket lines in bitter cold. They saw relationships strained, trust eroded, and the city pulled into conflict.

They do not want to see Regina go through that again.

A 510-Bed Camp Raises Real Concerns About Labour Stability

Retired workers are not making accusations. They are raising **reasonable concerns** based on lived experience.

A camp capable of housing more than five hundred workers on refinery property naturally raises questions:

- Could it be used to house replacement workers in a future dispute?
- Could it give management the ability to sustain a lockout longer?
- Could it weaken the bargaining position of local union members?
- Could it reignite the kind of conflict that once divided this city?

Retirees know what a lockout looks like. They know what it feels like. And they know how quickly tensions can escalate when one side appears to be preparing for a prolonged dispute.

Even the **perception** of such preparation is damaging.

Retired Workers Built This Facility — Their Concerns Deserve Respect

These men and women spent decades:

- operating units safely
- responding to emergencies
- training apprentices
- maintaining equipment
- protecting the refinery and the community

They understand the risks of industrial operations better than anyone. They know the importance of trust between workers and management. They know how fragile labour peace can be.

When they say this camp raises red flags, Council should listen.

While we, the retirees, are no longer part of the Refinery's day-to-day operations, we maintain a strong interest in its future. Having devoted many years of service to the Refinery, we remain concerned about the relationship between the company and its employees and the impact this relationship may have on the Refinery's long-term stability, success, and prosperity.

Safety Concerns Are Not Theoretical — Retirees Lived Them

Retired workers have seen:

- fires
- shutdowns
- evacuations
- near misses
- hazardous releases

They know how dangerous a refinery can be, even on a normal day. Housing 510 people on-site — people who may not be familiar with refinery hazards — creates a safety burden that retirees recognize immediately.

They spent their careers keeping people safe. They do not believe this camp supports that goal.

Retirees Want a Strong Refinery — But Not at the Cost of Community Trust

Retired workers want the refinery to succeed. They want it to thrive. They want it to remain a pillar of Regina's economy.

But they also know that success depends on:

- stable labour relations
- trust between workers and management
- respect for the people who built the place
- a community that feels secure and included

A 510-bed work camp threatens that balance.

Conclusion

Retired refinery workers are asking Council to consider not only the technical details of this proposal, but the human reality behind it.

They lived through the last lockout. They saw what it did to families, to workers, and to the city. They do not want to see Regina return to that kind of conflict.

The relationship between the Union and the Co-op Refinery has, in our opinion, deteriorated significantly over time. What was once a collaborative partnership grounded in mutual respect and a common vision has been eroded. We are concerned that the drive for profit has come to outweigh the cooperative values and integrity that formed the foundation of our existence and guided our success for many years.

For the sake of safety, community trust, labour stability, and respect for the people who built this facility, we urge Council to **reject** the Discretionary Use application for the 510-bed work camp.

Our message is simple: **Regina deserves better than repeating the past.**

Dan Devers, Regina, SK

DE26-100

CR26-123 - PL202600240 – 1102 N Fleet Street

Dear Members of the Regina Planning Commission,

My name is Jim Elliott and live in Regina.

I completely oppose this proposal. This is weaponizing our valued bylaws against the people of this city.

What the proponent is proposing is not a work camp. This is a measure to REPLACE not AUGMENT, LIMIT not DIVERSIFY the current employees in the time of collective bargaining.

As shown by the previous actions of the proponent, this is a way to circumvent the abilities of the current workers to limit their capacity to collectively bargain their wages in a civil and reasoned manner. In the event of a job action, this would remove one measure of bargaining action from the employees by restrict scab labourers access to the property.

I completely oppose this proposal as it goes against the valued provision of collective bargaining by leveraging the use of the city of Regina bylaws to put inappropriate pressures on the legitimate bargaining of a collective agreement between the employer and the union representing the workers of the facility.

This is standing on the side of the employer and not employees and residents of this city. This is discretionary for a reason because it is a political act and therefore should bring in the social implications as well as the input of the residents of this community.

Furthermore, how is it appropriate to have a proponent oppose a residential development further away from the refinery and now propose to have residential housing even closer to the refinery?

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Elliott

A key goal of Design Regina: The Official Community Plan, Bylaw 2013-48 (OCP), is fostering economic "vitality and competitiveness" (Section D10; Goal 1).

Work Camps represent additional assets available to industrial operators and businesses to expand, diversify or augment their operations and output. (page 2)

Per Chapter 2, Part 2B of the Zoning Bylaw, a Work Camp land use is defined as "… a temporary residential land use intended to provide accommodation for employees or contractors of industrial or construction operations…". Allowing a work camp provides industrial operators and businesses with an opportunity to diversify or augment employee/staffing resources on a temporary basis. (page 4)

DE26-101

My name is Mandla Mthembu, and I am a resident of the heritage neighborhood of Regina. I oppose this development because it violates labor rights and human rights, and it is not in any Regina resident's interest. My delegation will elaborate on the affirmation of these concerns and the condemnation of corporate greed over the workers and residents of our city that stand to be harmed if this project is approved.

DE26-102

City of Regina Council Delegate (re: Coop Refinery's discretionary land use application)
Sean Tucker, University of Regina
October 26, 2026

I am a part-time professor of occupational health and safety at the University of Regina and a consultant for public and private sector organizations. My work includes providing independent opinion and recommendations on a variety of health and safety issues.

Since 2014, I have followed and publicly commented on OHS and public health issues related to the refinery. I have also participated in the city's consultation process for the current application, including appearing as a delegate at last week's city planning commission meeting.

As a guiding principle, I believe there is nothing more important than the health and safety of the occupants of the proposed work camp.

In my opinion, there are two questions city council must address:

First, does council have a legal obligation to consider the potential health impacts of the work camp on the camp's 510 occupants?

And, second, if you do have a legal obligation to consider the potential health impacts, do you currently have sufficient information to exercise your due diligence and to make an informed decision?

With respect to the first question – your legal obligation to consider health and safety impacts on the occupants – Section 3.5 (Review Criteria) of Chapter 1 of the Regina Zoning Bylaw (2019) is clear that you do. It states: "Every application for a discretionary use shall be evaluated based on the following criteria." Four parts are listed including (d).

"(d) potential adverse impacts or nuisances affecting:
[…]
(vi) … public health and safety."

I would also note, in the past, the city has considered health impacts with respect to the refinery. In 2008, the city and provincial Ministry of the Environment required, as a condition of permit for a major expansion of the plant, an independent, comprehensive major hazards risk assessment report. The 186-page report assessed the potential of death and illness of a "worst case scenario" to residents living near the refinery.

In 2011, Regina Qu'Appelle Health, the Ministry of the Environment and the VP of the Refinery opposed the Somerset residential development, which is just under 1km away from the plant, due to public health concerns.

So it is clear in law and in past practice that the city must carefully consider health impacts of the refinery's operations.

Regarding my second question: do you currently have sufficient information to exercise your due diligence and make an informed decision on the application? I would argue that you do not have adequate information for the following reasons.

First, you do not have an independent, comprehensive risk assessment supporting locating a sizable work camp just 250m away from one of Canada's largest oil refineries.

During last week's planning commission meeting the refinery's representative characterized the 1/3-page letter provided by Baker Risk, which was a "joint effort" between Baker Risk and the refinery, has "definitive proof" that the camp is safe.

Further, regarding the risk assessment, the refinery's representative seemed to acknowledge:

- an extraordinary, worse-case scenario was not considered in the assessment
- only the risk of death to occupants of the camp was considered. It does not appear that serious illnesses due to exposures to toxic gases and other adverse conditions, including long-latency cancers, were considered.
- that standards for public health issues for residents may not be the same for those living on-site.
- no direct consultations with SHA, OHS and Regina Fire have occurred.

The representative stated "If this application gets approved there's a bit more work to do" including an emergency evacuation plan, where air monitoring will be placed and how they will be managed, and a fire plan.

Another significant omission is any evidence that SHA Public Health has reviewed and supports this plan to house over 500 people for two years next to one of Canada's largest oil refineries.

In closing, this is a serious matter as you are being asked to approve a work camp for 510 human beings living 250m away from one of Canada's largest oil refineries. There appears to be no urgency whatsoever to approving this application. Given the incomplete planning and serious shortcomings of the risk assessment, I strongly urge you to either reject the application or table it in order to gather more information.

DE26-103

I would like to speak in opposition to this item and share why I feel that it is unsafe, and not in the best interest of regina citizens and would provide no value or benefit to the local economy.

Nathan Kraemer, Regina, SK

Setting up this camp is dangerous to the people that will be potential workers. This fights against the workers there now and treats them as disposable. This is another example as to why we need anti-scab legislation. I have worked at the refinery and seen how poorly they treated new workers.

Thabo Mthembu, Regina, SK

DE26-105

Let me introduce myself – I'm Nathaniel Cole, and I am the Executive Director of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour.

Off the top, let me put it all on the table – I am both a trade unionist and a cooperator. And I know in Saskatchewan, that's not uncommon. It's because our vibrant labour movement and cooperative movement were born at the same time and out of the same desire for economic democratization, to build solidarity, and with a concern for community.

We're a big family. And it sucks when mom and dad are fighting, so to speak. But in the case of building a work camp on the site of the Coop Refinery Complex, the choice for me is clear.

Firstly, the camp is not necessary for refinery operations.

Should any commercial operation require additional temporary labour, Regina already has existing accommodation capacity to house temporary workers. The creation of a work camp is designed to isolate these 'workers' from the community.

It is another signal that this work camp is not for any other purpose than job action. The only reason CRC would need lodging on-site is because they'd expect be limited access on and off the refinery grounds during job action like the last time.

For the information of council, the use of 'replacement workers' or as they've been more commonly known, 'scabs,' is actually illegal in parts of this country. And there are good economic and ethical reasons for why banning this type of labour practice makes sense:

1. Restoring the balance of power to contract negotiations.
2. Preventing prolonged, bitter labour disputes.
3. Reducing picket-line conflict, tensions, and safety issues.
4. Protecting the constitutional right to strike.
5. Preserving community and worker stability.

While it's not illegal in Saskatchewan, is it really worth sticking Council's neck out on the this one? Because this application for a 'work camp' already signals that the Coop Refinery Complex is prepared for another tense lock out while skirting the constitutional rights of working people.

Which takes me to my next point – the increased likelihood of community tension. Labour disputes are emotional and contentious. Concentrating these labourers in a single location, behind a chain-link fence with helicopters flying in rations like a war zone ---- certainly can become a focal point for conflict and demonstrations.

I'd implore council to avoid this development. The camp risks becoming a symbol of division during what could be an already-difficult labour dispute, and this decision would increase rather than reduce tensions. Should council's decisions seek to escalate or mitigate tension in our city?

Others surely will note the public safety concerns, so I will make that part of my objection to this development brief. Have we thoroughly canvassed the health and safety concerns of having workers sleep right next to a refinery for weeks or months? Especially when the risk factors increase as the complex becomes less safe, simply due to the fact that the skeleton crew of scab labourers running the place will be less familiar with the operations altogether.

And when it comes to the additional traffic, security, policing, and emergency services, who bears the cost of those services? Surely the ratepayers of Regina will not be completely insulated from the expense of a city-approved work camp on the refinery grounds.

Council's responsibility *is not* to determine the outcome of a labour dispute. The City needs to remain neutral in labour disputes, but approving a dedicated replacement-worker camp creates the perception that municipal resources and approvals are being used to support one side of this potential dispute.

Council's responsibility *is* to protect the long-term interests of Regina residents. The proposed camp raises legitimate concerns regarding public safety, community impact, municipal costs, and the perception of municipal involvement in a private labour conflict. For these reasons, Council should decline to support the proposal.

Nathaniel Cole
Saskatchewan Federation of Labour
Regina, SK

DE26-106

October 26, 2026

Dear Council,

While I fully intended to represent the 700 unionized workers at City Council on October 28th, we are scheduled to be at the bargaining table with the Co-op Refinery at the same time, and my priority is bargaining.

In the unfortunate event I am unable to appear before you personally, please accept my written submission as our unequivocal objection to the Co-op Refinery's Discretionary Use permit application to build a work camp at 1102 N Fleet Street.

Last week, the Regina Planning Commission (RPC) voted 7-2 to recommend the application based on the Administration report and recommendation, but that should be ignored. The RPC was handcuffed by narrow criteria on which to base their decision. Not only does Council have the jurisdiction to expand the scope when making a decision of this nature, we still believe there are gaps in the original report, and the methodology that led to a flawed yes recommendation.

The Commission's report begins with:

> ***Policy Impact***
>
> *A key goal of Design Regina: The Official Community Plan, Bylaw 2013-48 (OCP), is fostering economic "vitality and competitiveness" (Section D10; Goal 1).*
>
> *Work Camps represent additional assets available to industrial operators and businesses to expand, diversify or augment their operations and output.*

Further in their recommendations:

> ***OTHER OPTIONS***
>
> ***Option 1 – Approve the Discretionary Use application for the proposed Work Camp land use– RECOMMENDED***
>
> ***Advantage:*** *Work Camps represent additional facility assets available to industrial operators and businesses to expand, diversify or augment their operations and output.*
>
> ***Consideration:*** *Public opposition was received through the public notice process, with concerns addressed by Administration in Appendix B – Public Feedback Summary of this report.*

It is our position that the work camp proposed does none of this. There is no expansion taking place, there is no diversification taking place, nor any augmentation of work. This is purely to replace workers for labour relations reasons.

Administration also relied upon Section D10: Goal 1 of Design Regina when establishing the basis for their recommendation. We feel this application does not "foster an environment conducive to economic vitality and competitiveness which supports the standard of living of residents in Regina and the surrounding region".

The Planning and Development Act, 2007, is cited several times regarding how the RPC's review of a Discretionary Use application must be confined to the prescribed land use matters. One of the stated purposes of the Act as per Part 1, 3:

> is *c) to support the development of environmentally, economically, socially, and culturally sustainable communities.*

Labour relations is a social issue. It is not a stretch to argue that the RPC was well within their rights under the Act to make a decision based on the labour relations impacts, and reject the application.

We believe the RPC could have exercised option 3 of the report which reads:

> *Option 3 – Deny the Discretionary Use application for the proposed Work Camp land use – NOT RECOMMENDED*
>
> *Advantage: There is no advantage associated with this option.*
>
> *Consideration: Reduces options available to industrial operators and businesses to expand, diversify or augment their operations and output.*
>
> Should City Council reject the application, it is a requirement, per section 57(2) of The Planning and Development Act, 2007, that the motion reflecting City Council's decision include reasons for the decision based on the evaluation criteria set out in the Zoning Bylaw.

The report continues with:

> *There are no financial, legal, strategic priority, labour, or Inclusion, Diversity, Equity & Accessibility (IDEA) impacts respecting this report.*

This application is not about expanding or diversifying or augmenting the refinery. It is solely about maintaining operations during a labour disruption. City Council should not rely on general benefits associated with industrial work camps without honestly considering the actual purpose of this particular camp.

Additionally, to say there are *no advantages* associated with denying the camp application is disappointingly short-sighted.

This camp is not a necessity. The refinery will not shut down, and Western Canada will not run out of fuel if the camp application is denied. The Co-op Refinery will still bring in its replacement workers; they will just have to sleep elsewhere. This means those workers stay in hotels or other short-term accommodations; they eat at restaurants and shop at retailers in Regina. These contributions to the local economy do not occur if they are housed on-site in a self-contained work camp.

Further, it is indisputable, based on the 2019-2020 lockout, that there was increased strain imposed on the Regina Police Service and other city services. Additional policing resources were required, and it pulled away from other areas of need within our city. The traffic disruptions that resulted were also an enormous headache for city residents and those attempting to access the city landfill on Fleet Street.

This all contributes to the significant reputational risk to the City of Regina if this work camp application is allowed to proceed.

Rejecting this application also removes a dark cloud over our bargaining process. Allowing a work camp to be built on site while the Union is trying to bargain in good faith a new collective agreement tilts the playing field further in favor of the employer. Lastly, the Administration's recommendation relies in part on API Recommended Practice 753. We believe City Council needs to look carefully at what it actually says.

API 753 provides guidance for managing the risks from refinery-related explosions, fires and toxic material releases to people in on-site portable buildings who are working, not for living. The proposal before you is for sleeping quarters for hundreds of people. This Council needs to be satisfied that the assessment being relied upon actually addresses the type of accommodation proposed and the risks associated with its intended use.

The standard's guiding principles say we should locate people away from process areas, minimize buildings close to those areas, and — most importantly — first attempt to eliminate the occupancy or the hazard as the first step in the hierarchy of controls.

The Union does not have to prove that the existence of a work camp is unsafe; it is on the applicant to prove that it is safe. But is city council content with "safe enough," or should we be looking at "safest possible"? What standard do you want to enforce? Because the safest possible option, according to API 753 that Co-op relies upon in their assessment from their consultant, says that not having a work camp anywhere on site is the safest option.

We are asking that City Council reject this application. The recommendation is based on flawed methodology. It is unnecessary and inflammatory. It does not meet the goals or purpose of the Official Community Plan for our great city. It would result in an economic loss that only costs taxpayers. It does not expand, diversify or augment the refinery operation.

There is no good reason to approve this application.

Sincerely,



Richard Exner

Unifor Local 594 President

DE26-107

Regina & District
LABOUR COUNCIL
Putting Unity in our Community

October 26, 2026

To: Mayor Chad Bachynski

City of Regina Executive Council

Re: CR26-123 Discretionary Use – 1102 N Fleet Street

On behalf of the Regina & District Labour Council, I am writing in opposition and disappointment for the consideration of a 2-year permit for a 510 bed 'temporary' replacement worker camp located approximately 300m away from one of Canada's largest oil refineries.

Firstly, the proposed camp is not essential to the refinery operations.

A temporary work camp is an isolating environment, where replacement workers are not relating with the community. This creates tension, not only in the community, but also in the workplace.

The optics appear that this work camp is not for any other purpose than job action. The only reason FCL would need lodging on-site is because there could be limited access on and off the refinery grounds during job action like the last time.

This application for the 'work camp' shows that the Coop Refinery Complex is preparing for another lock out situation, prior to the commencement of bargaining the collective agreement.

Workplace labour disputes can be emotional and contentious, creating division amongst workers trying to keep their jobs and pay bills in the current economic climate. Concentrating scab labourers in a single location, behind a chain-link fence with helicopters flying in rations certainly can become a focal point for conflict and demonstrations.

I stand with Labour and implore council to avoid this development. The work camp risks becoming a symbol of division during what could be an already-difficult labour dispute, and this decision would increase rather than reduce tensions. The decision made by this council will either seek to escalate or mitigate tensions in our city, during already increasingly difficult economic times.

The City of Regina, and this council must remain neutral , and approval of this temporary work camp would show that the municipality cares more for corporations and employers than it does for the working class people who make up a vibrant Regina. The people who live, work and play and call this city home. People who pay for the public services that this city provides. People who will bear the costs of additional policing and security should the approval be passed. Please consider all of the residents of Regina in this decision.

The safety concerns of living right on-site at the refinery are another workplace hazard. City officials and others must take whatever time is necessary to do their due diligence for the health and safety of all workers.

I ask of Council to decline to support the proposal.

Voting against this proposal is a vote for fairness, justice, and safety.

Respectfully submit,

Celeste Pinder

President

Regina & District Labour Council

DE26-108

Good afternoon. I am presenting in opposition to the permit application CR26-123 at the refinery due to safety concerns, risks, city involvement in labour disputes, and pressure on our health care system. We have seen the impact of catastrophic losses in places such as the Westray mine disaster, Halifax explosion, the recent fire at CFB Wainwright, and other places. The City of Regina also has cited safety concerns in the past due to risk. Housing people on site puts large amounts of people at risk and the city needs to oppose this application.

I am also requesting to present as late as possible as I will be working and would like to attend in person to present.

Darin Milo, Regina, SK

DE26-109

This application for a ‘work camp’ already signals that the Co-op Refinery Complex is prepared for another tense lock out situation, far ahead of negotiations even commencing.

This camp is not necessary for refinery operations.

Regina already offers accommodation for temporary workers needed by commercial operations. The proposed work camp is intended to keep these ‘workers’ isolated from the community. Could it be that these workers will be “scab” workers? We already know the answer to that.

This is another signal that the work camp is not for any other purpose than job action. The only reason FCL would need lodging on-site, would be because they expect limited access on and off the refinery grounds during job action just like the last time.

Labour disputes are emotional and contentious. Concentrating scab labourers in a specific location, behind a chain-link fence with helicopters flying in rations like a war zone ---- certainly can become a focal point for conflict and demonstrations.

I implore council to avoid this development. The camp risks becoming a symbol of division during what could be an already-difficult labour dispute, and this decision would increase rather than reduce tensions. Should council’s decisions seek to escalate or mitigate tension in our city? Are you not on the side of the worker?

Others will surely note the public safety concerns.

Have we thoroughly considered the health and safety concerns of having workers sleep right next to a refinery for weeks or months? Especially when the risk factors increase as the complex becomes less safe with scab workers who will be at a skeleton crew and be less familiar with the operations altogether.

Who will bear the costs of additional traffic, security, policing, and emergency services? Surely Regina’s ratepayers will shoulder at least some of the expense of a city-approved work camp on refinery grounds.

Council’s responsibility is to protect the long-term interests of Regina residents. The proposed camp raises legitimate concerns regarding public safety, community impact, municipal costs, and the perception of council's involvement in a private labour conflict. For these reasons, Council should decline to support the proposal.

Council’s role is not to decide the outcome of a labour dispute. The City must remain neutral, but approving a dedicated replacement-worker camp would give the impression that municipal resources and approvals favour one side.

Voting against this proposal is a vote for fairness, justice, and safety. Do not support this!

cb*cope225

Written Summary Brief – City Council Meeting, October 28, 2026

Submission to Regina City Council - Discretionary Use Application at 1102 N Fleet Street

Co-op Refinery Complex Delegation
Speaking: Mark Simpson, Director, Technical Services
Also in attendance: Andrew Swenson, Manager, Communications & Public Relations

Further to the information found in the application that City Administration is recommending for approval, we are providing the following additional information and context.

Collaboration with City Administration

- We have worked collaboratively with City of Regina Administration to ensure the application we've submitted is thorough and complete.
- We are pleased that City Administration has recommended that our Discretionary Use Application be approved.

Third-Party Risk Assessment

- CRC has conducted a third-party Risk Assessment through a highly reputable third-party organization regarding the siting of the potential camp.
- The third-party assessment is independent and signed in accordance with their responsibilities as Professional Engineers.
- The results of the risk assessment reinforced that the proposed location of the camp is inherently safe and does not pose a risk to human health.

Air Monitoring and Utilities

- The proposed camp would have its own dedicated air monitoring and testing.
- Air quality and wind direction were factors in proposing the camp's siting and are inputs to the overall risk assessment, which demonstrated the inherent safety of the location.
- The proposed camp would be self-contained and not put additional strain on city services or the power grid.

Additional Requirements

- We understand that this Discretionary Use Application is only for land use and agree with City Administration that we should be granted the permit.
- We understand that more permitting is required and will work collaboratively with all regulators to ensure a seamless process if we need to proceed with the camp.
- You will note in the report from City Administration that Regina Fire has been consulted.

Safety Planning for Personnel

- We are prepared to manage all safety and security aspects of the camp and have a dedicated on-site fire department, our own emergency response equipment, experienced

process safety and occupational health and safety professionals, and three on-site Occupational Health nurses.

- We will collaborate, as we always do, with the city on all aspects of emergency preparedness as it relates to the proposed camp.

Refinery Operations and Economic Prosperity

- We play a critical role in fuelling Western Canada, and it is our responsibility to plan for any event that could significantly impact operations or lead to business interruption.
- This permit would provide the flexibility to temporarily accommodate additional workers on refinery-owned land, if needed, to support the safe and reliable operation of the refinery.
- We hope never to require the work camp, as that would mean a business interruption has occurred. This permit is a practical contingency measure that helps support safety, reliability, and energy security for our community and province.

CP26-65

I am writing to voice my opposition to the “Discretionary Use” application for the “Work Camp” that has been proposed. I feel the ramifications of this camp have been grossly under-examined.

Firstly, the amp also feels like a direct threat to the bargaining leverage of the unionized workers at the Refinery. A work camp has only ever been erected twice in the refinery’s history, in 2016 and 2019. That it is happening again now feels like a slap in the face to the workers there now, and should construction of it go forward I cannot help but imagine that another strike will be imminent.

There’s also the matter of economic impact: not only will the city be spending a massive amount of money on a building that exists in a precarious location (which I will elaborate on further down), but the presence of this massive dormitory will prevent the temp workers from travelling to local hotels or restaurants, or any other establishments in the city. Not to mention, should a strike occur as per my previous point, those workers will also not be spending as normally as they do.

Finally, and in my opinion not the least of which, is the fact that this camp will be constructed on-site at the oil refinery. Any refinery is a high-risk environment, with a very real chance of catastrophic fires and/or explosions. Obviously we all hope that as many safety precautions will be taken at the refinery itself, but one of those precautions is ensuring that no one is living within a certain vicinity of the building to begin with. Furthermore, I am far more confident that these safety precautions will be followed by long-term trained employees as opposed to workers who are temporary, new to their position, and most likely not receiving sufficient training to keep things safe. These safety issues make me doubt that complete studies have been conducted regarding the safety of the camp’s location. Is it safe for the workers to spend that much uninterrupted time in such close proximity to the refinery? Are there are quality issues? Are they in a blast zone? And if any of these studies have been conducted, why are they not accessible to the public?

This entire project feels like it is lacking in forethought and planning, despite obvious dangers it presents to those who would potentially be staying there. I implore the city council to reject this proposal and stop this project before people get hurt. Thank you.

Tanner Vogelgesang, Regina, SK

CP26-75

Thank you for reaching out to the Saskatchewan Health Authority (SHA) regarding this project and for providing the opportunity to offer comments.

The SHA is responsible for administering The Public Health Act, 1994 and its associated regulations. The SHA does not provide approvals for worker accommodation, industrial camps, or similar developments. Public Health's involvement in such projects is generally limited to matters within its legislative mandate, including areas such as food safety, potable water, sewage disposal, and potential public health hazards.

Our understanding is that a Quantitative Risk Hazard Assessment (QRHA) was completed by a qualified third-party organization as part of the project review process. We understand that the assessment was conducted using recognized standards and methodologies applicable to QRHAs in Canada, and that the project proponent will be required to comply with all applicable legislation, regulations, standards, and recommendations arising from that assessment. The assessment summary concluded that the proposed camp location is compliant with API RP 753 and meets the siting requirements established by the project owner for portable structures.

After reviewing the information provided and considering the SHA's role under The Public Health Act, 1994 and associated regulations, the SHA has no comments regarding the proposed work camp at this time. Should Public Health requirements related to food safety, potable water, sewage disposal, or other matters under our jurisdiction be applicable, the SHA will work with the project proponent to support compliance with legislative and regulatory requirements.

Submitted by:
Lara Tella, Saskatchewan Health Authority – Public Health Regina, Regina, SK