December 12, 2022
3:00 p.m.
4th Floor City Hall

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   3.1 Adoption of Agenda

4. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES
   4.1 Adoption of Minutes - December 5, 2022

5. 2023 BUDGET PRESENTATION

6. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

7. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS
   7.1 Notices Published – 40 Hamlyn Road - DEV2200156

8. RATIFICATION OF EPOLLS

9. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   9.1 Committee of the Whole Report - November 30, 2022
      1. BlindSquare Event Wayfinding Pilot Project Recommendations
      2. Traffic Calming Policy Update (November 30,2022)
      4. Mobile Vending on the Parking Lot of Holy Heart High School
10. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)
   10.1 Development Permits List For December 1 - 7, 2022

11. BUILDING PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)
   11.1 Building Permits List

12. REQUISITIONS, PAYROLLS AND ACCOUNTS
   12.1 Weekly Payment Vouchers Ending Week of December 7, 2022

13. TENDERS/RFPS

14. NOTICES OF MOTION, RESOLUTIONS QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

15. OTHER BUSINESS
   15.1 Demolition of Dwelling – 276 Freshwater Road
   15.2 Art Procurement 2022

16. ACTION ITEMS RAISED BY COUNCIL

17. ADJOURNMENT
Minutes of Regular Meeting - City Council  
Council Chamber, 4th Floor, City Hall  

December 5, 2022, 3:00 p.m.  

Present:  
Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O’Leary  
Councillor Ron Ellsworth  
Councillor Sandy Hickman  
Councillor Jill Bruce  
Councillor Ophelia Ravencroft  
Councillor Jamie Korab  
Councillor Ian Froude  
Councillor Carl Ridgeley  

Regrets:  
Mayor Danny Breen  
Councillor Maggie Burton  
Councillor Debbie Hanlon  

Staff:  
Kevin Breen, City Manager  
Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager of Finance & Administration  
Tanya Haywood, Deputy City Manager of Community Services  
Jason Sinyard, Deputy City Manager of Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services  
Lynnann Winsor, Deputy City Manager of Public Works  
Cheryl Mullett, City Solicitor  
Susan Bonnell, Manager, Communications & Office Services  
Karen Chafe, City Clerk  
Jennifer Squires, Legislative Assistant  

Others:  
Bobby Fedder, Lawyer/Solicitor  

Land Acknowledgement  
The following statement was read into the record:  
“We respectfully acknowledge the Province of Newfoundland & Labrador, of which the City of St. John’s is the capital City, as the ancestral homelands of the Beothuk. Today, these lands are home to a diverse population of indigenous and
other peoples. We would also like to acknowledge with respect the diverse histories and cultures of the Mi’kmaq, Innu, Inuit, and Southern Inuit of this Province.”

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   
   As Mayor Breen was absent, Deputy Mayor O’Leary acted as chair and called the meeting to order.

2. **PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS**

3. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

   3.1 **Adoption of Agenda**

   SJMC-R-2022-12-05/547
   
   Moved By Councillor Ravencroft
   
   Seconded By Councillor Bruce

   That the Agenda be adopted as presented.

   For (8): Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

   **MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**

4. **ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES**

   4.1 **Adoption of Minutes - November 28, 2022**

   SJMC-R-2022-12-05/548
   
   Moved By Councillor Hickman
   
   Seconded By Councillor Ellsworth

   That the minutes of November 28, 2022, be accepted as presented.

   For (8): Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

   **MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**
5. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

5.1 **Amendment to Paid Parking Regulations**

By-law amendment to Paid Parking Regulations to add a provision related to payment for use of electric vehicle charging stations on Saturdays, Sundays, or any other defined as a holiday within the meaning of the Shops Closing Act, RSNL 1990, C. S-15.

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/549

_Moved By_ Councillor Bruce

_Seconded By_ Councillor Ellsworth

That Council adopt the following By-Law amendment relating to Paid Parking Regulations to add a provision related to payment for use of electric vehicle charging stations on Saturdays, Sundays, or any other defined as a holiday within the meaning of the Shops Closing Act, RSNL 1990, C. S-15.

1. This By-Law may be cited as the St. John’s Paid Parking Regulations (Amendment No. 1 – 2022).

2. Subsection 2(d) of the St. John’s Paid Parking Regulations is repealed and the following is substituted:

   “2(d) “motor vehicle” shall have the same meaning as in the Highway Traffic Act, RSNL 1990, c. H-3, as amended and shall include electric vehicles.”

3. Section 2 of the St. John’s Paid Parking Regulations is amended by adding the following definitions and renumbering the subsections accordingly:

   (1)”electric vehicle” means a vehicle that is propelled by one or more electric motors, using electrical energy stored in rechargeable batteries, or another energy storage device, and is capable of being plugged into an electric vehicle charging station, including, but not limited to, plug-in battery electric cars, fuel cell battery electric vehicles, and plug-in hybrid vehicles.
(2) "electric vehicle charging station" means the vehicle charging equipment, inclusive of the electric vehicle charging station pillar, electronic/physical parts, head, and any other relevant equipment used for the purposes of charging electric vehicles.

(3) "electric vehicle parking area" means a street, portion of a street, parking lot, or parking facility that is for parking electric vehicles, and which is controlled and regulated by parking meter(s), pay by phone app, pay station(s), and/or electric vehicle charging stations;

(4) "electric vehicle parking space" means a single space that is for parking an electric vehicle, and which is controlled and regulated by parking meter, pay by phone app, pay station(s), and/or electric vehicle charging station(s).

4. Section 7 of the St. John’s Paid Parking Regulations is repealed.

5. Section 13 of the St. John’s Paid Parking Regulations is repealed and the following is substituted:

6. Notwithstanding the foregoing, payment for parking shall not be required on Saturday or Sunday or on any other day defined as a holiday within the meaning of the Shops’ Closing Act, RSNL 1990, c. S-15, as amended; payment for parking does not include any payment required for the use of an electric vehicle charging station.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

5.2 Amendment to Ticketing Amendment By-Law
Amendment to Ticketing Amendment By-Law to add a provision related to the parking of vehicles that are not physically connected to electric vehicle charging stations in parking spaces designated for the charging of electric vehicles.

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/550

Moved By Councillor Bruce
Seconded By Councillor Ellsworth

That Council adopt the Ticketing Amendment By-Law to add the following provision related to the parking of vehicles that are not physically connected to electric vehicle charging stations in parking spaces designated for the charging of electric vehicles.

1. This By-Law may be cited as the St. John’s Ticketing Amendment Bylaw (Amendment No. 1 – 2022).

2. The following is added as Section 14 of the St. John’s Ticketing Amendment Bylaw:

14. (1) A person shall not park a vehicle so that the vehicle is parked in a space designated for the charging of electric vehicles unless that vehicle is physically connected to the electric charging station.

(2) Any person who violates or contravenes this section is guilty of an offence and is liable to a minimum fine of sixty dollars ($60.00).

(3) An offence under this section may be prosecuted by means of a traffic ticket under the provisions of the Provincial Offences Act.”

For (8): Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley
6. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

6.1 Extension of Non-Conforming Commercial Use in the Watershed - 758 Thorburn Road - DEV2200152

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/551
Moved By Councillor Korab
Seconded By Councillor Ravencroft

That Council reject the proposed application for an extension to a Commercial Garage (Non-conforming Use) at 758 Thorburn Road, as per the recommendation of the City Manager in accordance with Section 104(4)(d) City of St. John’s Act.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

6.2 Request for Parking Relief – 55 Kiwanis Street – INT2200067

Councillor Ravencroft questioned the amount of parking required for the proposed clinic. The Deputy City Manager of Planning, Engineering, & Regulatory Services clarified that the parking was determined by the square footage of the business.

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/552
Moved By Councillor Korab
Seconded By Councillor Hickman

That Council approve parking relief for 6 parking spaces at 55 Kiwanis for a Clinic Use.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)
6.3 **Notices Published – 101 Pennywell Road – DEV2200151**

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/553  
**Moved By** Councillor Korab  
**Seconded By** Councillor Ravencroft

That Council approve the application for a Home Occupation at 101 Pennywell Road for the inspection and virtual technical support for Electric Scooters, along with incidental retail sales.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**

6.4 **Notices Published – 174 Forest Road - DEV2200148**

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/554  
**Moved By** Councillor Korab  
**Seconded By** Councillor Bruce

That Council approve the Discretionary Use application for a Home Occupation at 174 Forest Road to produce small batch chocolates.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**

7. **RATIFICATION OF EPOLLS**

8. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

9. **DEVELOPMENT PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)**

9.1 **Development Permits List November 24 - 30, 2022**

Council considered the Development Permits List for information.
10. **BUILDING PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)**

10.1 **Week ending - December 1, 2022**

Council considered the Building Permit List for information.

11. **REQUISITIONS, PAYROLLS AND ACCOUNTS**

11.1 **Weekly Payment Vouchers for the Week Ending November 30, 2022**

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/555

Moved By Councillor Ellsworth

Seconded By Councillor Hickman

That the weekly payment vouchers for the week ending November 30, 2022, in the amount of $14,768,988.95 be approved as presented.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**

12. **TENDERS/RFPS**

12.1 **RFP 2022194 Engineering Services for Adding a Sixth Southlands Pump at the Ruby Line Pump Station**

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/556

Moved By Councillor Hickman

Seconded By Councillor Bruce

That Council award this RFP to Stantec Consulting Ltd. in the amount of $153,377.80 (HST included) based on the evaluation of the proposals by the City’s evaluation team as per the Public Procurement Act.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**

12.2 **2022221 - Supply & Delivery of Larue Parts**
Deputy Mayor O'Leary asked for clarification on what the parts were. The Deputy City Manager of Public Works explained that Larue was a brand name for snow blowers used by the City and that the call would ensure that parts were available to fix snow blowers for the upcoming winter season.

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/557
Moved By Councillor Ellsworth
Seconded By Councillor Ravencroft

That Council approve for award this limited call to the sole source provider, Provall Parts Limited, for $51,844.47 a year (HST not incl.) as per the Public Procurement Act.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

13. NOTICES OF MOTION, RESOLUTIONS QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

14. OTHER BUSINESS

14.1 Membership – St. John’s Transportation Commission

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/558
Moved By Councillor Froude
Seconded By Councillor Ellsworth

That Council appoint James Greey and Debbie Ryan to replace Paul Walsh and Kirsten Morry and that Commissioners Lynn Zurel and Tolulope Akerele be renewed for a second two-year term as well as to confirm Councillor Maggie Burton for a second term.

Further, that Commissioner Lynn Zurel be appointed as Chairperson during her second two-year term.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley
14.2 **Support for Municipalities Newfoundland and Labrador 2023 Annual Conference – St. John’s – October 25-28, 2023 – St. John’s Convention Centre**

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/559  
**Moved By** Councillor Ellsworth  
**Seconded By** Councillor Ridgeley

That Council support the 73rd Municipalities Newfoundland and Labrador Annual Conference and Trade Show through the sponsorship of a luncheon during the event as requested.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**

14.3 **SERC – Film Shoot Road Closure 6**

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/560  
**Moved By** Councillor Bruce  
**Seconded By** Councillor Ravencroft

That Council approve the requested road closures associated with the filming of the television series SurrealEstate.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**

14.4 **SERC – New Year’s Eve Events**

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/561  
**Moved By** Councillor Ravencroft  
**Seconded By** Councillor Ellsworth
That Council approve the road closures associated with the City of St. John’s New Year’s Eve Fireworks, and road closure and noise by-law extension associated with the George Street Association New Year’s Eve Event.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

14.5 Built Heritage Experts Panel – Selection of Chair

SJMC-R-2022-12-05/562

Moved By Councillor Froude
Seconded By Councillor Bruce

That Council approve of the appointment of John Hancock as Chair of the Built Heritage Experts Panel.

For (8): Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

15. ACTION ITEMS RAISED BY COUNCIL

16. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

__________________________________
MAYOR

__________________________________
CITY CLERK
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Notices Published – 40 Hamlyn Road - DEV2200156

Date Prepared: December 6, 2022

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 3

Decision/Direction Required:
A Discretionary Use application has been submitted by Red Pepper Restaurant for 40 Hamlyn Road.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The proposed application is for a Lounge within the existing Restaurant, which will have a floor area of approximately 43 m². Hours of operation will be Monday to Saturday, 11:30am to 8:00pm. Parking is provided on-site. The proposed application site is zoned Commercial Regional (CR), where a Lounge is a Permitted Use. Subject to Section 6.22, a Lounge shall be a Discretionary Use when located within 150 metres of a Residential Zone; therefore, due to its proximity to the R2 Zone on the opposite side of Hamlyn Road, the appropriate public consultation process was carried out for the application.

No submissions were received.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Property owner and neighbouring property owners.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:
   A Sustainable City: Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.

5. Accessibility and Inclusion: Not applicable.

6. Legal or Policy Implications: St. John’s Development Regulations Section 6.22 “Lounge”, Section 10.5 “Discretionary Uses” and Section 10 “Commercial Regional (CR) Zone”.

7. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Public advertisement in accordance with Section 4.8 Public Consultation of the St. John’s Envision Development Regulations. The City has sent written notices to property owners within a minimum 150-metre radius of the application sites. Application have been advertised in The Telegram newspaper at least twice and are posted on the City’s website. Written comments received by the Office of the City Clerk are included in the agenda for the regular meeting of Council.

9. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.

10. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

11. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.

12. Other Implications: Not applicable.

**Recommendation:**
That Council approve the Discretionary Use application to permit a Lounge at 40 Hamlyn Road.

**Prepared by:**
Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett, MCIP Supervisor – Planning & Development Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services

**Approved by:**
Jason Sinyard, P.Eng, MBA Deputy City Manager Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Notices Published - 40 Hamlyn Road.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - Dec 6, 2022 - 2:54 PM

Jason Sinyard - Dec 6, 2022 - 3:03 PM
Report of Committee of the Whole - City Council
Council Chambers, 4th Floor, City Hall

November 30, 2022, 9:30 a.m.

Present: Mayor Danny Breen
         Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O'Leary
         Councillor Ron Ellsworth
         Councillor Sandy Hickman
         Councillor Jill Bruce
         Councillor Jamie Korab
         Councillor Carl Ridgeley

Regrets: Councillor Maggie Burton
        Councillor Debbie Hanlon
        Councillor Ophelia Ravencroft
        Councillor Ian Froude

Staff:   Kevin Breen, City Manager
        Derek Coffey, Deputy City Manager of Finance & Administration
        Tanya Haywood, Deputy City Manager of Community Services
        Jason Sinyard, Deputy City Manager of Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services
        Lynnann Winsor, Deputy City Manager of Public Works
        Cheryl Mullett, City Solicitor
        Karen Chafe, City Clerk
        Christine Carter, Legislative Assistant

Others  Scott Winsor, Director of Engineering
        Amer Afridi, Manager, Transportation Engineering
        Edmundo Fausto, Sustainability Coordinator
        Victoria Etchegary, Manager, Organizational Performance & Strategy
        Trisha Rose, Facilitator, Accessibility & Inclusion
        Kelly Dyer, Communications & Public Relations Officer
        Steve Fagan, Supervisor, Traffic Analysis
        Lalita Thakali, Transportation Engineer
1. **BlindSquare Event Wayfinding Pilot Project Recommendations**

Deputy Mayor O’Leary presented the Decision Note outlining the recommendations from the Inclusion Advisory Committee regarding the BlindSquare Event Wayfinding Pilot.

The Deputy Mayor asked whether the android capacity for this App is anticipated to be available in 2023 for use during the Pedestrian Mall. Ms. Trisha Rose, Facilitator, Accessibility & Inclusion advised that the most up to date information that she has from the developer is that the android App is now ready for release, and it is expected before the end of the year or very early in the new year.

Feedback received from those with android devices indicated that they felt that it was a two-tier level of service and it was unfair that they were not able to access the service.

It was agreed that it was a great tool, and Council looks forward to having it available for all users next summer at the 2023 Pedestrian Mall.

**Recommendation**

**Moved By** Deputy Mayor O’Leary  
**Seconded By** Councillor Ellsworth

That Council approve continued use of the BlindSquare technology as a wayfinding and navigation tool at the 2023 Downtown Pedestrian Mall pending the anticipated release of an android version.

For (7): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Ridgeley

**MOTION CARRIED (7 to 0)**

2. **Traffic Calming Policy Update (November 30, 2022)**

Councillor Jill Bruce presented the Decision Note on the proposed changes to the City’s current Traffic Calming Policy and introduced Mr. Amer Afridi, Manager of Transportation Engineering, who reviewed each of the proposed changes and provided the rationale for each.

- **Collision History** – currently points are given to historical collisions that are only related to vulnerable road users. The revised scoring scheme considers additional collisions such as property damage only (PDO) and fatal/injury collisions as well as collisions related to
vulnerable road users. The proposed change is to consider PDO and fatal/injury collisions in the revised scoring.

- **Traffic Volume Threshold** - The maximum score allocated to traffic volume for both Local and Collector roads is 25 points. Based on 2011 Policy, Local roads get points from 900 vehicle per day (vpd) and reach maximum value at 2150 vpd. Similarly, Collector roads get points from 3000 vpd and reach maximum value at 5,500 vpd. Previous review (**DN March 2021 and IN Dec 2020**) recommended revising this upper volume threshold to make the scoring more sensitive to higher traffic volumes. Based on the sample of traffic volume data reviewed for the City’s Local and Collector streets, their upper volume threshold 2150 vpd and 5500 vpd, respectively, seems reasonable, and no proposed change to the upper volume thresholds for Local and Collector.

- **Non-local Traffic Volume**: Non-local traffic volume is difficult and expensive to measure accurately. Also, this factor is closely related to the total traffic volume, which is already part of the scoring system. Having non-local traffic volume factor, often a busy street gets points for the same matter twice. Therefore, previous review (**DN March 2021 and IN Dec 2020**) recommended removing this from the scoring scheme. Jurisdiction scan also shows that this factor is rarely used in scoring by other municipalities. The proposed Change is to remove non-local traffic volume in the revised screening and scoring scheme.

- **Street Context**: In previous reviews it was recommended to add more weights to street context, which is addressed by the following changes in the revised scoring scheme:
  
  o Points for sidewalk is increased by 5 points for Local Road. With this, the maximum point a street (Local or Collector) can get for sidewalk is 10. Score will be allocated based on the proportion of sidewalk for the given street as follows: If a street has sidewalks on both sides of the street, it gets no point; for each 20% missing sidewalk, 2 points is given; street gets maximum 10 points when there is missing sidewalk on both sides.

  o Some additional locations such as playgrounds, licensed childcare centers, library and retail stores are identified as pedestrian generators.

  o Adjacent Land Use is added as a new factor to provide weights related to land use context. With this scoring, street in a residential area, irrespective of whether it be a Local or Collector, gets
additional points based on the proportion of residential area fronting the street. A street gets 5 points if it is a fully residential area; 1 point is reduced for every 20% non-residential area, reaching 0 point when it is a fully non-residential area. **Proposed Change:** Above mentioned street context related components are added in revised scoring scheme.

- **Traffic Speed:** It was recommended that the score be developed for target speed. From Jurisdictional scan, all other municipalities have scoring for speed based on posted speed limit; and therefore, will keep same as in 2011 Policy. The maximum score for traffic speed is increased to 30 points; however, there will be no change in the scoring criteria, meaning a Local street gets 1 point for each 1 km/hr above posted speed and a Collector gets 1 point for each 1 km/hr above threshold (i.e., posted speed + 5 km/hr).

  **Proposed Changes:**
  - Scoring for traffic speed to be based on the posted speed limit.
  - Increase maximum score for traffic speed to 30 points.
  - A separate program/plan to formulate in future to evaluate speed reduction as a traffic initiative. Progress on this plan will depend on staff resource.

- **Removed Factors:** Three factors, namely, transit route, EMS route and block length, are removed from the revised scoring scheme. This aligns with the practices across other Canadian municipalities. **Proposed Change:** Remove transit route, EMS route and block length from the revised scoring scheme to be aligned with other jurisdictions.

- **Interrelated factors:** It was recommended that the score be developed for interrelated factors ([DN March 2021](#)). From Jurisdictional scan, no other municipalities use scoring criteria for interrelated factors.

  **Proposed Change:** it is recommended not to develop interrelated factors.

- **Request Initiation:** In the updated policy, a petition would be required to initiate the traffic calming process. The petition intends to minimize resources spent in evaluating streets which may not proceed due to insufficient resident support at the later stage of implementation. For the updated policy, it is proposed request initiator will obtain signatures from at least 25% of households on their street for the petition. Similar approaches have been practiced by other municipalities in Canada. A standard format for petition would be included in the updated policy and readily available to residents for use.
Proposed Change: Petition required from 25% of households for the requested street.

- **Formalize Temporary Implementations**: Based on the current practice, City first installs temporary traffic calming measures prior to the permanent ones. This approach provides an opportunity to testing and evaluating their impact for both residents/road users and the technical team and have proved to be more effective. It was recommended to formalize this practice (*DN March 2021*).

In the current practice, a public survey is conducted prior to implementation of the temporary measures. In the follow-up discussion with the Council held in September 2022, this survey was recommended to be removed from the traffic calming process.

**Proposed Change:**
- Install temporary traffic calming measures for warranted locations.
- Remove public survey step prior to the implementation of temporary measures.

- **Public Survey**: The public participation is key part of implementing permanent traffic calming measures in their neighborhoods. For this, public survey will be conducted by staff. This is the only survey that will give an opportunity to the residents to provide their input before the permanent installation.

According to the 2011 Policy, 60% of the affected residents would need “yes” vote to move to next step of implementation. In practice, this requirement for public survey was changed to “60% of responded survey”. This provision assigns “neutral” opinion on resident that do not respond. Previous review recommended to formalize this current practice (*DN March 2021*).

To make the traffic calming process more participatory, it is proposed that the minimum response rate of at least 50% +1 household response rate be considered for the survey in addition to the 60% support rate criteria. This means, if a street for traffic calming has a total of 100 HHs, at least 51 HHs would have to participate in the survey with 30.6 HHs supporting the installation. Similar approach is currently adopted in other municipalities in Canada.

**Proposed Change**: Consider the minimum response rate for public survey to be 50%+1 household with support from at least “60% of the responded” household.

- **Annual Priority List**: Current policy simply follows the ranking list when selecting the project for implementation. Whenever a new street is evaluated and is warranted for traffic calming, street ranking could
change, thereby impacting the priority for the implementation. For the updated policy, it was recommended to prioritize top 10 streets for implementation of traffic calming in each fiscal year so that it will allow technical team to prepare a systematic plan for implementation for the given fiscal year (*DN March 2021*).

**Proposed Change:** With the current staffing capacity staff can annually, prioritize a range of between 5 to 10 streets/segments for implementation.

- **Re-evaluation Timeline:** Based on 2011 Policy, if a street gets excluded from traffic calming for not meeting any of the traffic calming process criteria, it will have to wait at least 2 years for the next consideration. It is recommended that re-evaluation timeline be changed from 2-year to 5-year to allow more time to focus on new requests and optimize the resources (*DN March 2021*). If there is a major change in the traffic pattern, that street will be exempted from the evaluation timeframe due to constraint.

  **Proposed Change:** Re-evaluation timeframe to be 5-year period.

- **Cul-de-sacs and Crescents/P-loops:** Current policy does not screen out cul-de-sacs, crescents, and P-loops. Due to the nature of these streets, they never scored high enough to be eligible for traffic calming in the past. That means, there is a wastage of time and money for data collection and analysis to assess their eligibility. As such, the updated policy could be streamlined by excluding these from consideration, thereby focusing on most needed locations. Crescent could be sometimes long; therefore, limitation of 300 m is considered for their exclusion from traffic calming.

  **Proposed Change:** Screen out cul-de-sacs, P-loops and crescents that are less than 300 meters.

- **New Development/Rehab Works:** It was recommended to include provision for the application of traffic calming tools to the projects identified under new developments and road rehabs (*DN March 2021*). This aligns with the *Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan 2021* stating “*Require new development to anticipate and implement traffic calming measures consistent with the principles and objectives of the City’s Traffic Calming Policy, so that proactive measures can be applied before traffic problems arise.*”

  It is important that the traffic calming measures considered for these projects would not unduly affect service of emergency vehicles, transit buses and other vehicles, and would not create safety concerns.
Examples of traffic calming measures suitable for this type of projects are roundabouts, curb extensions and raised crosswalks. These projects typically do not involve public consultation on the traffic calming features; however, Staff may need to discuss with stakeholders such as schools and Metrobus, where needed.

In case of streets that are under the traffic calming potential list (score above 30) and are considered for City’s street rehab project, these streets would be given higher priority. The general traffic calming process to follow for this kind of project would be same as for the normal streets.

Proposed Change:

- Consider traffic calming tools to the projects identified for new developments.
- Streets qualified for traffic calming and considered for Rehab projects to be aligned with Rehab projects for implementation.

- Speeding Issue in Arterial Roads: In the follow-up discussion with the Council (September 2022), speeding issue in arterial roads was discussed. This road category falls outside of the Traffic Calming Policy. Traffic Calming policy applies to local and collector streets. Police enforcement program with RNC can be initiated to address speeding concerns along arterial street.

Proposed Strategy: It is recommended that a police committee be formed with internal and external stakeholders. This committee could meet three times a year to discuss and implement effective enforcement program.

Members of Council discussed the proposed changes as presented by Mr. Afridi and sought clarification on some particular areas including:

- whether major changes would warrant consultations with residents
- using data from previous complaints when making changes in areas
- bump-out usage and their importance for slowing traffic and making roads safer for pedestrians and cyclists
- having street calming incorporated during street rehabilitation
- formation of a speed committee for recommendations and feedback to Council, could include crossing guards
- pros and cons of surveying residents after temporary traffic calming
- changes to transit and EMS routes – ensuring that the general public are aware of this change, providing a list of streets where
traffic calming will not be possible due to the EMS/transit routes and that transit & EMS stakeholders be consulted on any issues

- whether a re-evaluation of streets for traffic calming can be considered before the 5 years set. Staff advised that they need to catch up with the requested locations and that two years is not possible, unless there are cases out of the norm they can consider.
- Implementing traffic calming into new developments/streets, and the use of traffic impact assessments, narrower streets, which does make for slower driving rates
- different speeds for different classes of streets should be looked at in the future.
- a communications strategy for the Traffic Calming policy for residents
- use of the provincial collision database, and stakeholder involvement

Recommendation

Moved By Councillor Bruce
Seconded By Councillor Ellsworth

That Council approve changes to the traffic calming policy process presented in this Decision Note for the Updated Traffic Calming Policy.

For (7): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (7 to 0)


Mr. Kevin Breen, City Manager, briefed Council on the Corporate Energy Performance Contract Implementation Decision Note which if approved would direct staff to proceed with the implementation of the Corporate Buildings Energy Performance Contract a “self-funded” program to modernize building systems, reduce deferred maintenance, improve facility resilience, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through guaranteed energy savings.

The City of St. John’s has committed to be an effective and a sustainable City today and for future generations and has re-enforced its ongoing commitment to act by improving organizational performance, investing in infrastructure upgrades, and contributing to action on climate change. This includes the Resilient St. John’s Community Climate Plan, adopted unanimously by council in March 2022, and the City Corporate Climate Plan adopted unanimously by council in May 2021. St. John’s is committed to the following targets in their Corporate Climate Plan:
Committee of the Whole - November 30, 2022  

- 40% reduction by 2030 and stretch target of 50% by 2030 from 2018 emissions.
- Net-zero by 2050 at the latest.

Buildings and facilities represent one of the most significant capital and operating costs of a municipality. The City of St. John’s over 40 buildings (counting only city operated administration, recreation, firehalls, depots, water treatment, waste water treatment, the Mary Brown’s Centre & SJCC) have a utility cost of over $6.7M per year. These utility costs were particularly impacted by rising fuel costs in the last year.

Mr. Breen advised that Mr. Edmundo Fausto, the City’s Sustainability Coordinator, has been working with Honeywell on energy saving opportunities to meet these goals, and we now need to decide on funding for the projects. Funding is accessible through various programs, which will see half of the costs for these initiatives implemented, and the remainder will be seen through savings once these initiatives are in place.

Mr. Fausto presented the recommendations to Council which include:

- Council approves staff to submit a capital (w/ Grant) application to FCM for their Pathway to Net-Zero Capital & Grant Program (knowing that decisions on proposals to FCM may take up to 6 months).

- That Council proceeds with the assumption the Project will require the City to capitalize up to $6,661,630 which will be repaid 100% from savings guaranteed through the EPC.

- Council directs staff to not delay implementation until FCM provides a decision.
  
  o The main grant for this project is the CCCF grant and it has a time-limited implementation period, so it is important to commence implementation.
  
  o Secondly, the pricing for material continues to go up and the pricing for the program proposed (with guarantee) can only held until year-end.
  
  o Under the existing grants arrangement, we have a $9.9M project that would be paid back fully through energy savings over the specified term of the program (15 years). If we are retroactively awarded the FCM capital grant it will only improve the outcomes of the EPC.
Recommendation

Moved By Councillor Ellsworth
Seconded By Deputy Mayor O'Leary

That Council directs staff to enter the implementation phase of the Energy Performance Contract Phase 1 Program, and that staff be authorized to establish the financing mechanism necessary for the City’s portion of program costs up to $6,661,630.

That Council directs staff to submit a Capital and Grant proposal to FCM to support the implementation phase of the Energy Performance Contract.

For (7): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (7 to 0)

4. Mobile Vending on the Parking Lot of Holy Heart High School

Recommendation

Moved By Councillor Bruce
Seconded By Deputy Mayor O'Leary

That Council grant permission to allow mobile vending on the parking lot of Holy Heart High School for the aforementioned event.

For (7): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (7 to 0)

_________________________

Mayor
Title: BlindSquare Event Wayfinding Pilot Project Recommendations

Date Prepared: November 14, 2022

Report To: Inclusion Advisory Committee

Councillor and Role: Debbie Hanlon, Inclusion Advisory Committee

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:

A decision is required with regards to future implementation of the BlindSquare Event Wayfinding and Navigation tool as an accessibility feature at Downtown Pedestrian Mall Events.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

In 2020, feedback was collected on inclusion and accessibility concerns after the first Downtown Pedestrian Mall Event took place. It was noted that wayfinding was difficult for people with vision loss or blindness due to the addition of event specific temporary items such as parklets, barricades, garbage receptacles and rest area furniture. Based on this feedback, one solution included that the City investigate implementing a wayfinding and navigation tool to assist pedestrian mall visitors at future events.

Through procurement, it was determined that BlindSquare Event was the most suitable technology to acquire. In addition to having the ability to be programmed specifically for the pedestrian mall, and having local support of the CNIB, BlindSquare is used worldwide and more specifically is used in many locations across Canada.

In 2021, the City of St. John’s and CNIB partnered to program the app for the Pedestrian Mall and the pilot project was soft launched. In June of 2022 the pilot was fully launched including promotion via multiple media availabilities, a media release, information sharing via City socials and CNIB socials as well as through the Inclusion Advisory Committee. The City and CNIB also offered two user orientation sessions.

In September of 2022, a public engagement process was initiated as part of the project evaluation. It included a public engagement webpage, a survey and stakeholder meetings. Results of the public engagement are available via the What We Heard Document. The feedback received was primarily positive with a consensus for the City to continue to implement the BlindSquare Event app as a wayfinding and navigation tool at the pedestrian mall. Some negative feedback was received regarding the technology being available for iOS operating devices only during the pilot with no Android version in place. BlindSquare have
indicated that an android version is in development but have yet to confirm an official release date. The City anticipates it will be available for 2023 Downtown Pedestrian Mall. CNIB local have confirmed that they have the capacity to continue to provide full assistance service and amendments ongoing upon approval.

**Key Considerations/Implications:**

1. **Budget/Financial Implications:**
   - 2021 and 2022 installation, network access and consultancy fees totaled $11,080.00.
   - Ongoing annual fees total $2100.00.

2. **Partners or Other Stakeholders:**
   - CNIB Local
   - CNIB Frontier Accessibility
   - Inclusion Advisory Committee
   - Community Services Department (Events, Healthy City and Inclusion)
   - Communications Division
   - PERS
   - LIS

3. **Alignment with Strategic Directions:**

   **A Connected City:** Increase and improve opportunities for residents to connect with each other and the City.

   **An Effective City:** Achieve service excellence though collaboration, innovation and modernization grounded in client needs.

4. **Alignment with Adopted Plans:**

   - Healthy City Strategy

5. **Accessibility and Inclusion:**

   The City works with the Inclusion Advisory Committee to identify, prevent and remove barriers that prevent access to municipal initiatives. The Inclusion Advisory Committee recommended the City investigate a wayfinding and navigation tool to increase independence for visitors of the pedestrian mall who benefit from wayfinding and navigation tools.

6. **Legal or Policy Implications:** None
7. Privacy Implications: None

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations:

An annual communication plan will be necessary under the direction of Communications Division.

9. Human Resource Implications: None

10. Procurement Implications:

Any future procurement of Blind Square applications must follow Provincial requirements.

11. Information Technology Implications: None

12. Other Implications: None

**Recommendation:**
That Council approve continued use of the BlindSquare technology as a wayfinding and navigation tool at the Downtown Pedestrian Mall pending the anticipated release of an android version.

**Prepared by:** Trisha Rose, Accessibility and Inclusion Facilitator
**Approved by:**
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What we Heard

BlindSquare Event at the Downtown Pedestrian Mall

November 2022
Disclaimer

This document provides a summary of what was heard from participants during this engagement process. It is not meant to reflect the specific details of each submission word-for-word, although attempts have been made to do so when possible.

The City produces a What We Heard document for every city-led public engagement project. This collected commentary is shared with the community to ensure we heard you correctly.

The City protects the privacy of those who provide feedback as per Access to Information and Privacy Legislation.

The full scope of commentary is used by city staff and Council to help inform recommendations and decisions.
A CONNECTED CITY

Background

• Feedback on the Downtown Pedestrian Mall in 2020 noted there were accessibility concerns for persons with disabilities and that BlindSquare, a voice activated wayfinding system, might be a tool the City could use to improve accessibility for those who are blind or have low vision.

• In 2021, Staff worked with BlindSquare, the Canadian National Institute for the Blind (CNIB), and City internal stakeholders to determine how the technology could be programmed and used for the Downtown Pedestrian Mall.

• In 2022 the app was launched as a pilot project at the start of the Pedestrian Mall.

• The app currently works for iOS operating devices; the developer of BlindSquare is working on an android version for 2023.

• Some people with visual impairments were critical of the app after the launch due to its limited availability for devices other than iOS.

• CNIB offered training/information sessions for those interested in learning more about the app.
Purpose of Engagement

The purpose of the public engagement was to provide user experience feedback and staff perspective which will inform the project team’s assessment of whether the pilot project met its objectives. As well, it will help determine whether to continue to use the app, enhance usage, or discontinue the app.
Engagement and Communications

- Public Service Announcement issued on Sept. 19, 2022
- Project page on EngageStJohns.ca published on Sept. 19, 2022
- Newsletter to 3697 registered users and followers of EngageStJohns.ca
- Posts to regular City communications channels including social media, listservs, website
- Email to CNIB and other service providers to share with their distribution lists
- Inclusion Advisory Committee asked to share with their distribution lists
Who Engaged

On EngageStJohns.ca
- Total Visits: 74

Survey Responses
- 26 responses

Meeting with Organizational Stakeholders:
- CNIB
- Frontier (BlindSquare App)

Email:
- 3 submissions

Meeting with Staff
- Risk Management
- Communications
- Regulatory Services
- Land Information Services
- Events and Services
- Inclusion Services
What We Heard Highlights

• There is a view that offering accessibility improvements through BlindSquare is a good thing for the City to do.

• Those who used the app found it easy and helpful; those who attended the information sessions with the CNIB found them helpful as well.

• Concerns were expressed around the limited availability (iOS only at this time) making the app accessible only to those with an iPhone/iPad/iPod.

• Concerns were expressed around the promotion and awareness of the app as a tool for navigation for only users with vision loss or blindness however the app can be used by others as well.

• There is generally agreement that the City should explore the use of the app for other events and services/locations.

• There was a lot of learning in 2022 which can streamline and improve the use of the app going forward.
What We Heard Details - Survey

26 people responded to the survey

• 7 people were blind or had low vision – 3 of them used the app
  • Of those who used the app, all said it was easy to use, it helped them locate amenities and they attended the information session which was helpful
  • One area for improvement was noted: Tell the user when they are on the road versus sidewalk
  • Those who did not use the app said they either did not have an iPhone or simply did not know how to use it
  • Majority said the city should explore other locations to use the app such as at events like the Festival of Music and Lights, City parks, Metrobus, other recreation facilities

• What we heard from users:
  • “It was an amazing feeling to be able to identify the things around me.”
  • “Where it exists, I will use it! It gives independence, accessibility and safety.”
  • “I think having Blind Square available at more locations will increase independence for people who are blind/partially sighted.”
What We Heard Details - Survey

- 3 people who completed the survey had other disabilities but were not blind and did not have low vision
  - While this group was aware of the app, none of them used it
  - They did not use the app because they did not have an iPhone or did not know how to use the app
  - One person felt the City should use the app in other locations; one person was undecided
  - Biggest concern was that the app was only using iOS and limiting access as a result
- 16 respondents fell into “other” category – only three of these used the app or knew someone who used it
  - Of those who used it, they found it to be easy to use
  - Those who attended the information session found it helpful
  - There was a concern about the app only being available on iPhone
  - More people need to know about the app
- Majority of all respondents said the City should explore using BlindSquare in other locations including City events, parades, parks, Mary Brown’s Centre, City sidewalks, shopping centres, and hospitals.
What We Heard Details - Survey

When asked what else the Pedestrian Mall could do to improve accessibility, feedback included:

• Install pedestrian/bicycle elevators on the streets above and below Water St.
• Continue to allow bicycles on the street as some people use them for mobility
• Add bicycle ramps to the stairs on Prescott St. or replace them with a separate lane for easier access
• Accessible washrooms are a must
• Have an information kiosk
• Provide a map of all businesses within the mall footprint
• Explore a shuttle service from a larger parking area
• Ensure ramps into buildings are truly accessible and not creating tripping hazards
What We Heard - Email

• Two very positive emails outlining how people felt using the app at the pedestrian mall

• One very negative email regarding the lack of consultation with people in the community during the development phase and concerns with the IOS only option
What We Heard - Stakeholder Groups

• 2022 was a trial year, the team learned a lot about the app
• Team members received feedback from users that was positive about their experience
• There were some glitches as the team navigated the inputs for data but CNIB did most of the tagging which was very helpful
• “Look around” feature was good as people could "look around" and plan their outing before coming to the site
• Pedestrian Mall infrastructure changes as parklets are built/removed, people move tables/chairs, etc., which posed challenges to ensure all tags were current
What We Heard - Stakeholder Groups

- CNIB needs to get more people familiar with the app to improve uptake
- An android version is a must going forward
- CNIB can do a walkthrough of the area to plan for next year
- Promotional video was not usable – need content earlier that can be shared with other potential users, i.e. cruise ships/tourism, etc..
- Battery life of phone depleted by use in app
- Need a simple tip sheet for users – quick facts
- All agreed it would be worthwhile to continue with the app and expand use
- Some interest in using it for temporary events as well
- There is interest in connecting with other groups to discuss how the app can be used in tandem with other technology to improve accessibility overall
What We Heard - City Staff

- Communications would like more time to prepare for roll out and ongoing promotion
- City insurance process worked well
- Land Information Services can be more involved with the data entry/tagging process
- Challenges with keeping the physical site barrier-free, i.e., moving tables and chairs, etc.
- Opportunity to improve information sharing between Inspection Services and Inclusion team as new parklets are added
- There were staff changes before and during app roll out which impacted the project
- There is no data available from the app provider on the number of downloads and usage in a given geographic location. This impacted the evaluation process.
- Need to let people know to download the app in advance – save data usage
- Name of the app may not fully capture what it can do as a wayfinding tool
Next Steps

- Release What We Heard
- Develop a decision note with recommendations
A CONNECTED CITY

To stay informed
Follow the project page or sign up to receive notifications at EngageStJohns.ca
What we Heard
BlindSquare Event at the Downtown Pedestrian Mall

Disclaimer
This document provides a summary of what was heard from participants during this engagement process. It is not meant to reflect the specific details of each submission word-for-word, although attempts have been made to do so when possible.

The City produces a What We Heard document for every city-led public engagement project. This collected commentary is shared with the community to ensure we heard you correctly.

The City protects the privacy of those who provide feedback as per Access to Information and Privacy Legislation.

The full scope of commentary is used by city staff and Council to help inform recommendations and decisions.

Background
• Feedback on the Downtown Pedestrian Mall in 2020 noted there were accessibility concerns for persons with disabilities and that BlindSquare, a voice activated wayfinding system, might be a tool the City could use to improve accessibility for those who are blind or have low vision.
• In 2021, Staff worked with BlindSquare, the Canadian National Institute for the Blind (CNIB), and City internal stakeholders to determine how the technology could be programmed and used for the Downtown Pedestrian Mall.
• In 2022 the app was launched as a pilot project at the start of the Pedestrian Mall.
• The app currently works for iOS operating devices; the developer of BlindSquare is working on an android version for 2023.
Some people with visual impairments were critical of the app after the launch due to its limited availability for devices other than iOS.

CNIB offered training/information sessions for those interested in learning more about the app.

Purpose of Engagement
The purpose of the public engagement was to provide user experience feedback and staff perspective which will inform the project team’s assessment of whether the pilot project met its objectives. As well, it will help determine whether to continue to use the app, enhance usage, or discontinue the app.

Engagement and Communications
• Public Service Announcement issued on Sept. 19, 2022
• Project page on EngageStJohns.ca published on Sept. 19, 2022
• Newsletter to 3697 registered users and followers of EngageStJohns.ca
• Posts to regular City communications channels including social media, listservs, website
• Email to CNIB and other service providers to share with their distribution lists
• Inclusion Advisory Committee asked to share with their distribution lists

Who Engaged

On EngageStJohns.ca
• Total Visits: 74

Survey Responses
• 26 responses

Meeting with Organizational Stakeholders:
• CNIB
• Frontier (BlindSquare App)

Email:
• 3 submissions

Meeting with Staff
• Risk Management
• Communications
• Regulatory Services
• Land Information Services
• Events and Services
• Inclusion Services

What We Heard Highlights
• There is a view that offering accessibility improvements through BlindSquare is a good thing for the City to do.
• Those who used the app found it easy and helpful; those who attended the information sessions with the CNIB found them helpful as well.
• Concerns were expressed around the limited availability (iOS only at this time) making the app accessible only to those with
an iPhone/iPad/iPod.

- Concerns were expressed around the promotion and awareness of the app as a tool for navigation for only users with vision loss or blindness however the app can be used by others as well.
- There is generally agreement that the City should explore the use of the app for other events and services/locations.
- There was a lot of learning in 2022 which can streamline and improve the use of the app going forward.

What We Heard Details – Survey

26 people responded to the survey
- 7 people were blind or had low vision – 3 of them used the app
  - Of those who used the app, all said it was easy to use, it helped them locate amenities and they attended the information session which was helpful
  - One area for improvement was noted: Tell the user when they are on the road versus sidewalk
  - Those who did not use the app said they either did not have an iPhone or simply did not know how to use it
  - Majority said the city should explore other locations to use the app such as at events like the Festival of Music and Lights, City parks, Metrobus, other recreation facilities
- What we heard from users:
  - “It was an amazing feeling to be able to identify the things around me.”
  - “Where it exists, I will use it! It gives
independence, accessibility and safety.”
• “I think having Blind Square available at more locations will increase independence for people who are blind/partially sighted.”

What We Heard Details - Survey
• 3 people who completed the survey had other disabilities but were not blind and did not have low vision
  • While this group was aware of the app, none of them used it
  • They did not use the app because they did not have an iPhone or did not know how to use the app
  • One person felt the City should use the app in other locations; one person was undecided
  • Biggest concern was that the app was only using iOS and limiting access as a result
• 16 respondents fell into “other” category – only three of these used the app or knew someone who used it
  • Of those who used it, they found it to be easy to use
  • Those who attended the information session found it helpful
  • There was a concern about the app only being available on iPhone
  • More people need to know about the app
• Majority of all respondents said the City should explore using BlindSquare in other locations including City events, parades, parks, Mary Brown’s Centre, City sidewalks, shopping centres, and hospitals.

What We Heard Details - Survey
When asked what else the Pedestrian Mall could do to improve accessibility, feedback included:
• Install pedestrian/bicycle elevators on the streets above
and below Water St.

- Continue to allow bicycles on the street as some people use them for mobility
- Add bicycle ramps to the stairs on Prescott St. or replace them with a separate lane for easier access
- Accessible washrooms are a must
- Have an information kiosk
- Provide a map of all businesses within the mall footprint
- Explore a shuttle service from a larger parking area
- Ensure ramps into buildings are truly accessible and not creating tripping hazards

**What We Heard - Email**

- Two very positive emails outlining how people felt using the app at the pedestrian mall
- One very negative email regarding the lack of consultation with people in the community during the development phase and concerns with the IOS only option

**What We Heard - Stakeholder Groups**

- 2022 was a trial year, the team learned a lot about the app
- Team members received feedback from users that was positive about their experience
- There were some glitches as the team navigated the inputs for data but CNIB did most of the tagging which was very helpful
- “Look around” feature was good as people could "look around" and plan their outing before coming to the site
• Pedestrian Mall infrastructure changes as parklets are built/removed, people move tables/chairs, etc., which posed challenges to ensure all tags were current

What We Heard - Stakeholder Groups
• CNIB needs to get more people familiar with the app to improve uptake
• An android version is a must going forward
• CNIB can do a walkthrough of the area to plan for next year
• Promotional video was not usable – need content earlier that can be shared with other potential users, i.e. cruise ships/tourism, etc..
• Battery life of phone depleted by use in app
• Need a simple tip sheet for users – quick facts
• All agreed it would be worthwhile to continue with the app and expand use
• Some interest in using it for temporary events as well
• There is interest in connecting with other groups to discuss how the app can be used in tandem with other technology to improve accessibility overall

What We Heard - City Staff
• Communications would like more time to prepare for roll out and ongoing promotion
• City insurance process worked well
• Land Information Services can be more involved with the data entry/tagging process
• Challenges with keeping the physical site barrier-free, i.e., moving tables and chairs, etc.
• Opportunity to improve information sharing between Inspection Services and Inclusion team as new parklets are added
• There were staff changes before and during app roll out which impacted the project
• There is no data available from the app provider on the number of downloads and usage in a given geographic location. This impacted the evaluation process.
• Need to let people know to download the app in advance – save data usage
• Name of the app may not fully capture what it can do as a wayfinding tool

Next Steps
To stay informed
Follow the project page or sign up to receive notifications at EngageStJohns.ca.
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Traffic Calming Policy Update (November 30, 2022)

Date Prepared: November 23, 2022

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor and Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Transportation & Regulatory Services

Decision/Direction Required:
This Decision Note (DN) presents a summary of proposed changes to the City’s current Traffic Calming Policy. The proposed changes are based on previous traffic calming policy review and council recommendations, feedback from public engagement including stakeholder consultation, review of traffic calming policies from municipalities across Canada and recent follow-up discussion with the Council.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

The current Traffic Calming Policy and the associated Traffic Calming Warrant were developed in 2011. They were designed to manage the requests to slow traffic speed, discourage non-local traffic, and/or correct or improve perceived safety concerns in the street network.

In June 2020, Staff prepared an overview of the City’s Traffic Calming Policy and presented to the Council initiating the policy update process. Following this, in December 2020, Staff prepared a review of the policy and identified key areas for updating the policy.

In March 2021, following the policy review, 12 policy update areas were identified, which were categorized into two groups. The first category, as listed below, was mostly related to improving project selection and scoring criteria, whereas the second was more related to enhancing traffic calming process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Selection and Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Traffic Calming Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume Threshold</td>
<td>Annual Priority List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Local Traffic Volume</td>
<td>Formalize Temporary Implementations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrelated Factors</td>
<td>Public Survey Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Speed</td>
<td>Public Response Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Context</td>
<td>Re-evaluation Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Development/Rehab Work</td>
<td>Cul-de-sacs and Crescents/P-loops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In **August 2022**, Staff presented a list of proposed updates for the policy. In September 2022, a follow-up discussion with the Council was carried out for their input on the policy updates presented in **August 2022 Decision Note**. Additional feedback and comments raised during this meeting is included in this Decision Note.

### Key Policy Updates

The following are the list of proposed updates on City's 2011 Traffic Calming Policy.

**Collision History:** According to the current Traffic Calming Policy 2011 (also referred to as the 2011 Policy), points are given to historical collisions that are only related to vulnerable road users. The revised scoring scheme considers additional collisions such as property damage only (PDO) and fatal/injury collisions as well as collisions related to vulnerable road users. The weight allocated is 1 point for each PDO collision and 2 points for each fatal/injury collision. The point for vulnerable road users related collisions will remain same.

*Proposed Change:* Consider PDO and fatal/injury collisions in the revised scoring.

**Traffic Volume Threshold:** The maximum score allocated to traffic volume for both Local and Collector roads is 25 points. Based on 2011 Policy, Local roads get points from 900 vehicle per day (vpd) and reach maximum value at 2150 vpd. Similarly, Collector roads get points from 3000 vpd and reach maximum value at 5,500 vpd. Previous review (**DN March 2021 and IN Dec 2020**) recommended revising this upper volume threshold to make the scoring more sensitive to higher traffic volumes.

Based on the sample of traffic volume data reviewed for the City’s Local and Collector streets, their upper volume threshold 2150 vpd and 5500 vpd, respectively, seems reasonable.

*Proposed Change:* No proposed change to the upper volume thresholds for Local and Collector.

**Non-local Traffic Volume:** Non-local traffic volume is difficult and expensive to measure accurately. Also, this factor is closely related to the total traffic volume, which is already part of the scoring system. Having non-local traffic volume factor, often a busy street gets points for the same matter twice. Therefore, previous review (**DN March 2021 and IN Dec 2020**) recommended removing this from scoring scheme. Jurisdiction scan also shows that this factor is rarely used in scoring by other municipalities.

*Proposed Change:* Remove non-local traffic volume in the revised screening and scoring scheme.
Street Context: Previous review (DN March 2021 and IN Dec 2020) recommended to add more weights to street context, which is addressed by the following changes in the revised scoring scheme:

- Points for sidewalk is increased by 5 points for Local Road. With this, the maximum point a street (Local or Collector) can get for sidewalk is 10. Score will be allocated based on the proportion of sidewalk for the given street as follows: If a street has sidewalks on both sides of the street, it gets no point; for each 20% missing sidewalk, 2 points is given; street gets maximum 10 points when there is missing sidewalk on both sides.

- Some additional locations such as playgrounds, licensed childcare centers, library and retail stores are identified as pedestrian generators.

- Adjacent Land Use is added as a new factor to provide weights related to land use context. With this scoring, street in a residential area, irrespective of whether it be a Local or Collector, gets additional points based on the proportion of residential area fronting the street. A street gets 5 points if it is a fully residential area; 1 point is reduced for every 20% non-residential area, reaching 0 point when it is a fully non-residential area.

**Proposed Change:** Above mentioned street context related components are added in revised scoring scheme.

Traffic Speed: It was recommended that the score be developed for target speed (DN March 2021). From Jurisdictional scan, all other municipalities have scoring for speed based on posted speed limit; and therefore, will keep same as in 2011 Policy. The maximum score for traffic speed is increased to 30 points; however, there will be no change in the scoring criteria, meaning a Local street gets 1 point for each 1 km/hr above posted speed and a Collector gets 1 point for each 1 km/hr above threshold (i.e., posted speed + 5 km/hr).

During the follow-up discussion with the Council, the possibility of speed limit reduction for slow neighborhood street was emphasized. Reducing the speed limits throughout the city would require significant resources and a plan. This study is outside of the Traffic calming Policy update. Depending on the staff resources this traffic initiative can be explored in future.

**Proposed Changes:**
- Scoring for traffic speed to be based on the posted speed limit.
- Increase maximum score for traffic speed to 30 points
- A separate program/plan to formulate in future to evaluate speed reduction as a traffic initiative. Progress on this plan will depend on staff resource.
**Removed Factors:** Three factors, namely, transit route, EMS route and block length, are removed from the revised scoring scheme. This aligns with the practices across other Canadian municipalities.

**Proposed Change:** Remove transit route, EMS route and block length from the revised scoring scheme to be aligned with other jurisdictions.

**Interrelated factors:** It was recommended that the score be developed for interrelated factors *(DN March 2021).* From Jurisdictional scan, no other municipalities use scoring criteria for interrelated factors.

**Proposed Change:** it is recommended not to develop interrelated factors.

**Request Initiation:** In the updated policy, a petition would be required to initiate the traffic calming process. The petition intends to minimize resources spent in evaluating streets which may not proceed due to insufficient resident support at the later stage of implementation. For the updated policy, it is proposed request initiator will obtain signatures from at least 25% of households on their street for the petition. Similar approaches have been practiced by other municipalities in Canada. A standard format for petition would be included in the updated policy and readily available to residents for use.

**Proposed Change:** Petition required from 25% of households for the requested street.

**Formalize Temporary Implementations:** Based on the current practice, City first installs temporary traffic calming measures prior to the permanent ones. This approach provides an opportunity to testing and evaluating their impact for both residents/road users and the technical team and have proved to be more effective. It was recommended to formalize this practice *(DN March 2021).*

In the current practice, a public survey is conducted prior to implementation of the temporary measures. In the follow-up discussion with the Council held in September 2022, this survey was recommended to be removed from the traffic calming process.

**Proposed Change:**
- Install temporary traffic calming measures for warranted locations.
- Remove public survey step prior to the implementation of temporary measures.

**Public Survey:** The public participation is key part of implementing permanent traffic calming measures in their neighborhoods. For this, public survey will be conducted by staff. This is the only survey that will give an opportunity to the residents to provide their input before the permanent installation.
According to the 2011 Policy, 60% of the affected residents would need “yes” vote to move to next step of implementation. In practice, this requirement for public survey was changed to “60% of responded survey”. This provision assigns “neutral” opinion on resident that do not respond. Previous review recommended to formalize this current practice (DN March 2021).

To make the traffic calming process more participatory, it is proposed that the minimum response rate of at least 50% +1 household response rate be considered for the survey in addition to the 60% support rate criteria. This means, if a street for traffic calming has a total of 100 HHs, at least 51 HHs would have to participate in the survey with 30.6 HHs supporting the installation. Similar approach is currently adopted in other municipalities in Canada.

In absence of this step, there is a chance that a street even with a very low response rate can easily qualify for traffic calming. For example, consider a street for traffic calming has a total of 100 households (HH) with the following response statistic from Public Survey:

- Total number of HH responded = 10
- Number of HH supporting traffic calming = 6
- Number of HH against traffic calming = 4
- % of responded HH in favor of traffic calming = 60%

In this scenario, the given street would be qualified for implementation of traffic calming despite a very low percentage of HH involvement (10%) and an even lower percentage of HHs stating they are in favour (6%). It is important to have a good representation of residents involved for a successful implementation of the project.

Proposed Change: Consider the minimum response rate for public survey to be 50%+1 household with support from at least “60% of the responded” household.

Annual Priority List: Current policy simply follows the ranking list when selecting the project for implementation. Whenever a new street is evaluated and is warranted for traffic calming, street ranking could change, thereby impacting the priority for the implementation. For the updated policy, it was recommended to prioritize top 10 streets for implementation of traffic calming in each fiscal year so that it will allow technical team to prepare a systematic plan for implementation for the given fiscal year (DN March 2021).

Proposed Change: With the current staffing capacity staff can annually, prioritize a range of between 5 to 10 streets/segments for implementation.

Re-evaluation Timeline: Based on 2011 Policy, if a street gets excluded from traffic calming for not meeting any of the traffic calming process criteria, it will have to wait at least 2 years for the next consideration. It is recommended that re-evaluation timeline be changed from 2-year to 5-year to allow more time to focus on new requests and optimize the resources (DN March 2021).
If there is a major change in the traffic pattern, that street will be exempted from the evaluation timeframe due to constraint.

**Proposed Change:** Re-evaluation timeframe to be 5-year period.

**Cul-de-sacs and Crescents/P-loops:** Current policy doesn’t screen out cul-de-sacs, crescents, and P-loops. Due to the nature of these streets, they never scored high enough to be eligible for traffic calming in the past. That means, there is a wastage of time and money for data collection and analysis to assess their eligibility. As such, the updated policy could be streamlined by excluding these from consideration, thereby focusing on most needed locations. Crescent could be sometimes long; therefore, limitation of 300 m is considered for their exclusion from traffic calming.

**Proposed Change:** Screen out cul-de-sacs, P-loops and crescents that are less than 300 meters.

**New Development/Rehab Works:** It was recommended to include provision for the application of traffic calming tools to the projects identified under new developments and road rehabs (DN March 2021). This aligns with the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan 2021 stating “Require new development to anticipate and implement traffic calming measures consistent with the principles and objectives of the City’s Traffic Calming Policy, so that proactive measures can be applied before traffic problems arise.”

It is important that the traffic calming measures considered for these projects would not unduly affect service of emergency vehicles, transit buses and other vehicles, and would not create safety concerns. Examples of traffic calming measures suitable for this type of projects are roundabouts, curb extensions and raised crosswalks. These projects typically do not involve public consultation on the traffic calming features; however, Staff may need to discuss with stakeholders such as schools and Metrobus, where needed.

In case of streets that are under the traffic calming potential list (score above 30) and are considered for City’s street rehab project, these streets would be given higher priority. The general traffic calming process to follow for this kind of project would be same as for the normal streets.

**Proposed Change:**
- Consider traffic calming tools to the projects identified for new developments.
- Streets qualified for traffic calming and considered for Rehab projects to be aligned with Rehab projects for implementation.

**Speeding Issue in Arterial Roads:** In the follow-up discussion with the Council (September 2022), speeding issue in arterial roads was discussed. This road category falls outside of the Traffic Calming Policy. Traffic Calming policy applies to local and collector streets. Police
enforcement program with RNC can be initiated to address speeding concerns along arterial street.

**Proposed Strategy:** It is recommended that a police committee be formed with internal and external stakeholders. This committee could meet three times a year to discuss and implement effective enforcement program.

Table 1 presents revised scoring scheme reflecting above proposed changes. The updated scoring scheme has a single table for Local and Collector roads. However, it is noted that the factors such as traffic volume and traffic speed are weighted differently for these two road categories. Also, some of the scoring factors that represent a common theme are regrouped under the same heading, which has resulted into a total of six different categories, namely, collision history, traffic volume, traffic speed, pedestrian generators, active transportation facilities and adjacent land use. It is noted that the seasonal factor such as sidewalk snow clearance is not practical and cannot be added in the revised scoring scheme.

**Table 2: Revised Scoring Scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Factor</th>
<th>Point Criteria</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collision History</td>
<td>1 point for each Property Damage Only (PDO) collision in the past 3 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Updated policy considers scores for PDO and injury/fatal collisions too; Max points for local and collector are same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 points for each injury/fatal collisions, or 2 points for each collision involving vulnerable road users in the past 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume</td>
<td><strong>Local road:</strong> 1 point for every 50 vehicles above 900 vpd</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Collector road:</strong> 1 point for every 100 vehicles above 3,000 vpd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Speed</td>
<td><strong>Local road:</strong> 1 point for each 1 km/h above posted speed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Maximum point increased: 10 points added to Local and 5 to Collector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Collector road:</strong> 1 point for each 1 km/h above threshold (i.e., posted speed + 5 km/hr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Generators</td>
<td>5 points for each high school, park, playground, licensed childcare centre, library, residential retail store, community centre or senior facility within study area, to max of 10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>More facilities added in the pedestrian generator list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 points if there is an elementary school or safe route to school within the study area, to max of 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scoring Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point Criteria</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Transportation Facilities</strong> &lt;br&gt; 0 if sidewalk existed on both sides, 10 points if missing on both sides, Give 2 points for each 20% sidewalk missing. That means: 0 - sidewalk exists on both sides 2 pts - Approx 20% of sidewalk missing 4 pts - Approx 40% of sidewalk missing 6 pts - Approx 60% of sidewalk missing 8 pts - Approx 80% of sidewalk missing 10 pts - no sidewalks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Weight increased for vulnerable road users (DN March 2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For sidewalk</strong>: 0 if sidewalk existed on both sides, 10 points if missing on both sides, Give 2 points for each 20% sidewalk missing. That means: 0 - sidewalk exists on both sides 2 pts - Approx 20% of sidewalk missing 4 pts - Approx 40% of sidewalk missing 6 pts - Approx 60% of sidewalk missing 8 pts - Approx 80% of sidewalk missing 10 pts - no sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For bike route</strong>: 5 points if there is an existing bike route or is part of Bike Master Plan full network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjacent Land Use</strong> &lt;br&gt; 5 points if fully residential area; reduce 1 point for every 20% non-residential area. That means: 5 points - All residential area 4 points - Approx 80% residential area 3 points - Approx 60% residential area 2 points - Approx 40% residential area 1 point - Approx 20% residential area 0 point - non-residential area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adjacent Land Use factor added to incorporate residential neighbourhoods along Collector roads (DN March 2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjacent Land Use</strong> &lt;br&gt; 5 points if fully residential area; reduce 1 point for every 20% non-residential area. That means: 5 points - All residential area 4 points - Approx 80% residential area 3 points - Approx 60% residential area 2 points - Approx 40% residential area 1 point - Approx 20% residential area 0 point - non-residential area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Blue ones are the factors or Criteria added in the revised scoring table

### Key Considerations/Implications:

1. **Budget/Financial Implications:**

   City has recently increased [Traffic Calming Program budget for 2022](#) from $50,000 to $200,000.

2. **Partners or Other Stakeholders:**

   Stakeholders, namely, Emergency Medical Service (EMS) - Eastern Health, Royal Newfoundland Constabulary (RNC) and Metrobus were consulted for their comments and feedback on City’s Traffic Calming Policy and Program.

3. **Alignment with Strategic Directions:**
A City that Moves: Create a sustainable and accessible, low-carbon public transportation system.

A City that Moves: Improve safety for all users on a well-maintained street network.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: N/A

5. Accessibility and Inclusion: N/A

6. Legal or Policy Implications:

This note is part of a policy review and update. After proposed changes in this Decision Note once finalized, the updated policy document will be prepared in cooperation with the Office of the City Clerk and other City departments.

7. Privacy Implications: N/A

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations:

Public Engagement was undertaken by Transportation Engineering and Organizational Performance and Strategy teams in February 2022. Accordingly, “What We Heard” document was released in March 2022.

9. Human Resource Implications: N/A

10. Procurement Implications: N/A

11. Information Technology Implications: N/A

12. Other Implications: N/A

Recommendation:
That Council approve changes to the traffic calming policy process presented in this Decision Note for the Updated Traffic Calming Policy.

Prepared by: Lalita Thakali, Transportation System Engineer
Approved by: Amer Afridi, Manager Transportation Engineering
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DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Corporate Energy Performance Contract Implementation

Date Prepared: October 31, 2022

Report To: Special Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Ian Froude, Transportation and Regulatory Services & Sustainability

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:

For Council to direct staff to proceed with the implementation of the Corporate Buildings Energy Performance Contract a “self-funded” program to modernize building systems, reduce deferred maintenance, improve facility resilience and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through guaranteed energy savings.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

The City of St. John’s strives to be an effective and a sustainable City today and for future generations. These are two strategic directions expressed in the City of St. John’s Strategic Plan. City of St. John’s Council has re-enforced its ongoing commitment to act by improving organizational performance, investing in infrastructure upgrades, and contributing to action on climate change. This includes the Resilient St. John’s Community Climate Plan, adopted unanimously by council in March 2022, and the City Corporate Climate Plan adopted unanimously by council in May 2021. St. John’s is committed to the following targets in their Corporate Climate Plan:

- 40% reduction by 2030 and stretch target of 50% by 2030 from 2018 emissions.
- Net-zero by 2050 at the latest.

Buildings and facilities represent one of the most significant capital and operating costs of a municipality. The City of St. John’s over 40 buildings (counting only city operated administration, recreation, firehalls, depots, water treatment, waste water treatment, the Mary Brown’s Centre & SJCC) have a utility cost of over $6.7M per year. These utility costs were particularly impacted by rising fuel costs in the last year.

In addition to annual utilities the City needs to invest in operations and maintenance of these assets and has a long list of near term and long term capital investments needed. This
includes a number of pieces of equipment that are either approaching end of life or would benefit from renewal. It is important to remember that an aging building portfolio is more expensive to operate, is less energy efficient, encompasses more risk of failure and a sudden cost, and emits more greenhouse gases. For example, a boiler at or near end of life will catastrophically fail when under it’s heaviest load, in the dead of winter. Emergency replacement is very difficult and expensive, and difficult on the people living and working in the City.

Failure to modernize can lead to high operating costs, high unexpected costs, and a premature need to replace a facility as overall condition worsens.

The Energy Performance Contract (EPC)

Throughout 2020-2022 the City and Honeywell worked together to complete a preliminary Opportunity Assessment, which benchmarked and identified City facilities with high energy use and identified energy saving and GHG reducing opportunities. Subsequently, Honeywell was awarded (through competitive RFP) a contract to develop a detailed Building Energy Improvements Report. This energy and facility renewal work included energy audits, feasibility and design, financing, savings calculations, staff engagement, grant applications, and other support to characterize the investment required from the City to implement. This is all to ensure the constructability of the project, and that it meets the “self-funded” requirement, and level of detail needed for Honeywell to provide an energy savings guarantee for the duration of the payback period.

Council is now presented with the opportunity to move to Step 4: Program Implementation, finalize negotiations of implementation and guarantee contracts, and secure the financing required to capitalize the project.

About the EPC Phase 1 Proposed Implementation

The proposed improvements would include:

- replacing a number of the outdated assets in the City’s portfolio,
- address some deferred maintenance, and
- enable a modernized building portfolio that leverages best practices while depending less on fossil fuels.

Replacing and installing modern equipment will improve heating and cooling to improve user and staff experience and comfort; as well as being able to manage and reduce the building energy use and costs. The EPC Phase 1 includes the following facilities and energy efficiency measures:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Lighting LED</th>
<th>Fuel Switching (full or partial)</th>
<th>Recommissioning Building Systems</th>
<th>Continuous Commissioning Tool</th>
<th>Expand Controls</th>
<th>Air Infiltration Mitigation</th>
<th>Heat Recovery in MUA Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works Depot</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Annex</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 Freshwater Rd</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Shelter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fire Station</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Fire Station</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Fire Station</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckmaster Rec. Centre</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winsor Lake WTP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Bulls Big Pond</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Harbour WTP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverhead WWTP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Brown Centre &amp; SCC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowring Park Locker and Day Camp</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: this measure is dependent on confirmation from an additional grant application to FCM Net-Zero Pathways Capital + Grant program.

This EPC is made up of selected, shortlisted measures from a lengthy list of opportunities across the portfolio to meet the performance requirements (payback of 15 years or less) set for Phase 1 of the EPC. EPC Phase 1, now ready for implementation, will provide a major improvements and benefits to the City operations:

- $511,263 in energy and maintenance savings per year for the City, which will be leveraged to pay for the City’s Infrastructure improvement costs;
- Electrification of these facilities will reduce 346,667 L of oil used for heating (equivalent to about 124 homes), while adding only 185 kW of electricity use (equivalent to about 26 homes).
- Reduce the City’s greenhouse gas emissions by 1,118 tonnes CO₂eq
  - This is a 11% reduction of Corporate GHG emission (2018 baseline); or
  - 1/4 of the City’s 2030 Corporate commitment of reducing its emissions by 40% from the 2018 baseline;
  - With this project, the provincial efforts to implement a low-carbon electricity grid, and improved new city buildings, the City may be on track to achieve over 70% of its 2030 target before 2025.
Financials

The proposed EPC is a “self-funded” project that is designed to be 100% paid-back by the guaranteed savings within a 15 year term. Therefore, the proposed project has been developed to be cost-neutral to the City (i.e., all capital expenses, construction, and financing costs are paid back within the targeted payback period by the energy and contracted operating savings; no labour costs to the City are included in the saving calculations), and this will be measured, verified, and guaranteed by Honeywell for the duration of the contract. Any overachievement of savings and any savings made after the capital investment is recovered go to the City. Any overachievement of savings are for the City’s benefit only (not shared).

The City and Honeywell collaborated to leverage relevant grants available to the City during the EPC Program development. The following structure is what is confirmed and expected to exist to support the proposed program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Challenge Fund Grant (CCCF)</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$3,110,577 (awarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Energy Audit 2021 Capital</td>
<td>Previously Allocated Capital</td>
<td>$100,000 (approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TakeCHARGE Audit and Feasibility Grants</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$144,000 (awarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM Feasibility Study Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$200,000 (submitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TakeCHARGE retrofit rebates Grants</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$116,000 (TBC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total Grants: $3,670,428

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost: (not including 245 Freshwater Fuel Switching)</td>
<td>$9,990,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John’s Capital:</td>
<td>$6,320,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FCM Pathway to Net-Zero Capital + Grant Application

To capture the full proposed scope and secure the City’s financing requirement it is possible to apply to the “FCM Pathway to Net-Zero Capital + Grant” which is a Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) program that may consider capitalizing all or a portion of the EPC scope for the City. However, FCM decisions can take 3 to 6 months and require an application with the level of detail that we have arrived to now.

The Pathway to Net-Zero Capital program provides competitive interest rates for capital through FCM, as well a grant of (25%) from the total capital requested (e.g., $2.2M grant on a $8.9M capital request).
It is proposed that Council approves staff to apply for the capital needed to implement the full scope outlined before, while maintaining the payback period below 15 years payback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Challenge Fund Grant (CCCF)</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$3,110,577 (awarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Energy Audit 2021 Capital</td>
<td>Previously Allocated Capital</td>
<td>$100,000 (approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TakeCHARGE Audit and Feasibility Grants</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$144,000 (awarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM Feasibility Study Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$200,000 (submitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TakeCHARGE retrofit rebates Grants</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$116,000 (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM Pathway to Net-Zero</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$2,220,544 (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Grants:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,890,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,552,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including 245 Freshwater Fuel Switching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. John’s Capital</strong> (through FCM Pathway to Net-Zero Capital program):</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,661,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

Staff recommend that:

- Council approves staff to submit a capital (w/ Grant) application to FCM for their Pathway to Net-Zero Capital & Grant Program (knowing that decisions on proposals to FCM may take up to 6 months).
- That Council proceeds with the assumption the Project will require the City to capitalize up to $6,661,630 which will be repaid 100% from savings guaranteed through the EPC.
- Council directs staff to not delay implementation until FCM provides a decision.
  - The main grant for this project is the CCCF grant and it has a time-limited implementation period, so it is important to commence implementation.
  - Secondly, the pricing for material continues to go up and the pricing for the program proposed (with guarantee) can only held until year-end.
  - Under the existing grants arrangement we have a $9.9M project that would be paid back fully through energy savings over the specified term of the program (15 years). If we are retroactively awarded the FCM capital grant it will only improve the outcomes of the EPC.
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: for the City to capitalize up to $6,285,423 to cover its portion of the funds. Financing costs will be off set in their entirety by energy savings in the operating budget on an annual basis.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Corporate Energy Team, Utilities.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans: An Effective City, A Sustainable City. Climate Emergency Declaration. Climate Change Corporate GHG Reduction Targets (30% and stretch target of 40% by 2030 from 2018).

4. Legal or Policy Implications: Legal departments and procurement have been involved in the review of the energy performance contract.

5. Privacy Implications: N/A

6. Engagement and Communications Considerations: N/A

7. Human Resource Implications: The Sustainability Coordinator will lead the implementation process and engage the Corporate Energy Team, relevant facility occupants, as well as legal, and finance and administration services as implementation proceeds.

8. Procurement Implications: Procurement was conducted in accordance with City policy and the implementation of the project is captured within the Energy Performance Contract competitive RFP process.

9. Information Technology Implications: Information systems will be engaged to ensure specifications meet technology requirements within the City’s operations.

10. Other Implications: During the 18 month total construction period coordination will be ongoing with relevant departments to minimize disruption to operations.

Recommendation:
That Council directs staff to enter the implementation phase of the Energy Performance Contract Phase 1 Program, and that staff be authorized to establish the financing mechanism necessary for the City’s portion of program costs up to $6,661,630.

That Council directs staff to submit a Capital and Grant proposal to FCM to support the implementation phase of the Energy Performance Contract.

Prepared by: Edmundo Fausto, Sustainability Coordinator

Approved by:
CITY OF ST. JOHN’S ENERGY PERFORMANCE CONTRACT

Honeywell
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FIRM SELECTED, NEWFOUNDLAND EPCs

Honeywell Ltd: Motto: ‘Our innovative technologies make the world cleaner, more sustainable, more secure, connected, energy efficient, and productive’. $33B business in 4 divisions

7,000+ EPCs saving $6 B/Yr
22,800 Engineers worldwide
Operating as a CanadianESCO since 1983 (1st at Twillingate Hospital, NL EPC)

*New EPC commenced Dec 2021

Recent Newfoundland 
Honeywell Energy Performance Contracts

Corner Brook:
Town of Corner Brook
MUN Phase 2
Grenfell Campus
Western Health
Honeywell Office

Gander:
Town of Gander Phase 1
Town of Gander Phase 2
GIAA (study phase)
Honeywell Office

Grand Falls-Windsor:
Town of Grand Falls-Windsor

St, John’s:
MUN Phase 1
MUN Phase 2
Eastern Health
Eastern Health
Phase 2 (Study Phase)*
Honeywell Office
An EPC is a comprehensive self-funded program whereby the equipment and technology Honeywell installs to modernize assets and facilities will be paid by guaranteed energy and other savings, grants and incentives.

Requires close collaboration.

The City of St. John’s & Honeywell have teamed to collaboratively develop the finance and technical components for a ‘design/build/perform/guarantee’ project.
**EPC MILESTONE STEPS COMPLETED**

- Competitive RFP carried out, Honeywell Energy Solutions Group selected
- Letter of Intent completed and signed to proceed to EPC solution development
- EPC solution development carried out with staff stakeholders from Corporate Buildings, Fire Stations, Process Plants (water, wastewater, waste management), Mary Brown’s Centre and SJCC, and Recreation Programs
- EPC team worked with Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), TakeChargeNL and Provincial Government to secure additional funding for the project
- Contract finalization under consideration, upon signature we proceed to implementation
- After implementation, Honeywell guarantees the savings for the 15 year finance term
SCOPE CATEGORIES

1. **Fuel switching** – installing an electric boiler to replace heating from an oil boiler provides multiple benefits including efficiency improvement across all seasons, it is now less expensive to heat a space with electricity than with oil, and this measure results in a large reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Addresses deferred maintenance, replaces old boiler
   - *Examples* Works Depot, Animal Control Centre, Buckmaster Centre installation of an Electric Boiler and domestic hot water heater

2. **Recommissioning Building Systems** – calibrate and/or replace sensors and bring system back to intended design
   - *Example City Hall* controls recommissioning and air balancing, modify sequence of operations

3. **Expand Controls** – for energy efficient HVAC equipment, inclusion into existing Delta automation, better troubleshooting
   - *245 Freshwater* bring unit heaters, running uncontrolled, heating unoccupied areas under efficient control

4. **Continuous Commissioning Tool** – every 15 minutes selected HVAC system operations will be optimized all year
SCOPE CATEGORIES

5. **Air Infiltration Mitigation** – carry out sealing measures for roof/wall, door and other gaps in a facility to avoid cold air infiltration and warm air exfiltration
   - *Bay Bulls Water Treatment Plant*, built in the 1970s will have all gaps will be sealed

6. **Heat Recovery** – to collect waste heat from mechanical systems for use elsewhere in the facility
   - *Riverhead Water Treatment Plant* – recovering heat from 17 Air Handling Units and Exhaust Fans

7. **Lighting conversion to LED** results in improved lighting provided with less energy using LED technology
   - *Example Mary Brown’s Centre* – multiple fluorescent lighting technologies operating at 2 different voltages will be replaced with LED, providing a new standard
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Lighting LED</th>
<th>Fuel Switching (full or partial)</th>
<th>Recommissioning Building Systems</th>
<th>Continuous Commissioning Tool</th>
<th>Expand Controls</th>
<th>Air Infiltration Mitigation</th>
<th>Heat Recovery in MUA Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works Depot</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Annex</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 Freshwater Rd</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Shelter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fire Station</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Fire Station</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Fire Station</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckmaster Rec. Centre</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winsor Lake WTP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Bulls Big Pond</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Harbour WTP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverhead WWTP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Brown Centre &amp; SCC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowring Park Locker and Day Camp</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: this measure is dependent on confirmation from an additional grant application to FCM Net-Zero Pathways Capital + Grant program.
**SCOPE PROPORTION BY FACILITY**  
"BASE PROJECT", ASSUMING FCM CAPITAL GRANT NOT AWARDED

**Facility Key:**
- Works Depot
- Animal Shelter
- Buckmaster Rec. Centre
- Riverhead WWTP
- City Hall
- Central Fire Station
- Winsor Lake WTP
- Paradise Fire Station
- Petty Harbour WTP
- Bowring Park
- City Hall Annex
- West End Fire Station
- Bay Bulls Big Pond
- Mary Brown’s Ctr, SJCC

$9,990,664  
Total Base Project Cost

$6,320,236  
City Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Cost/ Facility</th>
<th>Total Grants, incentives, funding</th>
<th>Savings/ Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works Depot</td>
<td>$ 2,177,738</td>
<td>$ 377,110</td>
<td>$ 154,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>$ 578,488</td>
<td>$ 37,481</td>
<td>$ 31,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Annex</td>
<td>$ 78,134</td>
<td>$ 6,474</td>
<td>$ 4,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 Freshwater Rd</td>
<td>$ 179,449</td>
<td>$ 9,132</td>
<td>$ 19,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Shelter</td>
<td>$ 997,677</td>
<td>$ 627,798</td>
<td>$ 13,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fire Station</td>
<td>$ 163,089</td>
<td>$ 10,479</td>
<td>$ 15,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Fire Station</td>
<td>$ 30,820</td>
<td>$ 2,295</td>
<td>$ 3,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Fire Station</td>
<td>$ 24,990</td>
<td>$ 1,860</td>
<td>$ 2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckmaster Rec. Centre</td>
<td>$ 991,485</td>
<td>$ 662,692</td>
<td>$ 13,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winsor Lake WTP</td>
<td>$ 374,533</td>
<td>$ 26,200</td>
<td>$ 10,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Bulls Big Pond</td>
<td>$ 436,232</td>
<td>$ 39,249</td>
<td>$ 35,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Harbour WTP</td>
<td>$ 161,819</td>
<td>$ 15,734</td>
<td>$ 10,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverhead WWTP</td>
<td>$ 3,060,437</td>
<td>$ 1,795,394</td>
<td>$ 134,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood Bay</td>
<td>$ 64,676</td>
<td>$ 4,741</td>
<td>$ 4,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Brown’s Ctr, SJCC</td>
<td>$ 597,331</td>
<td>$ 50,512</td>
<td>$ 33,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowring Park</td>
<td>$ 73,768</td>
<td>$ 3,278</td>
<td>$ 4,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 9,990,665</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 3,670,428</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 492,062</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Tax included*
**SCOPE PROPORTION BY FACILITY**
FULL PROJECT, ASSUMING FCM CAPITAL GRANT IS AWARDED

**$12,552,601**
Base Project + FCM Pathways Grant

**$6,661,630**
City Component

### Facility Key:
- Works Depot
- City Hall Annex
- Animal Shelter
- West End Fire Station
- Buckmaster Rec. Centre
- Bay Bulls Big Pond
- Riverhead WWTP
- Mary Brown’s Ctr, SJCC
- City Hall
- 245 Freshwater Rd
- Central Fire Station
- Paradise Fire Station
- Winsor Lake WTP
- Petty Harbour WTP
- Robin Hood Bay
- Bowring Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Cost/ Facility</th>
<th>Total Grants, incentives, funding</th>
<th>Savings/ Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works Depot</td>
<td>$ 2,177,738</td>
<td>$ 377,110</td>
<td>$ 154,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>$ 578,488</td>
<td>$ 37,481</td>
<td>$ 31,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Annex</td>
<td>$ 78,134</td>
<td>$ 6,474</td>
<td>$ 4,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 Freshwater Rd</td>
<td>$ 2,741,386</td>
<td>$ 2,229,675</td>
<td>$ 45,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Shelter</td>
<td>$ 997,677</td>
<td>$ 627,798</td>
<td>$ 13,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fire Station</td>
<td>$ 163,089</td>
<td>$ 10,479</td>
<td>$ 15,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Fire Station</td>
<td>$ 30,820</td>
<td>$ 2,295</td>
<td>$ 3,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Fire Station</td>
<td>$ 24,990</td>
<td>$ 1,860</td>
<td>$ 2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckmaster Rec. Centre</td>
<td>$ 991,485</td>
<td>$ 662,692</td>
<td>$ 13,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winsor Lake WTP</td>
<td>$ 374,533</td>
<td>$ 26,200</td>
<td>$ 10,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Bulls Big Pond</td>
<td>$ 436,232</td>
<td>$ 39,249</td>
<td>$ 35,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Harbour WTP</td>
<td>$ 161,819</td>
<td>$ 15,734</td>
<td>$ 10,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverhead WWTP</td>
<td>$ 3,060,437</td>
<td>$ 1,795,394</td>
<td>$ 134,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood Bay</td>
<td>$ 64,676</td>
<td>$ 4,741</td>
<td>$ 4,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Brown’s Ctr, SJCC</td>
<td>$ 597,331</td>
<td>$ 50,512</td>
<td>$ 33,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowring Park</td>
<td>$ 73,767</td>
<td>$ 3,278</td>
<td>$ 4,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 12,552,601</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 5,890,971</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 517,914</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Tax included
Before and after the EPC, St John’s budget remains net neutral

- Project guaranteed to cover capital and financing costs by Honeywell
- Departments net utility and material operating budgets guaranteed to remain net neutral
- Guaranteed Savings Cashflow across departments make up financing payments. Each Department would simply contribute their estimated and proven savings per year
- Measurement and Verification carried out yearly and included in presented payback period
FINANCING – GRANTS AND INCENTIVES

The Energy Performance Contact attracts multiple grants and incentives that reduce the total project cost.

$3.7M from approved, awarded and other funding grants include:

- Climate change Challenge Fund (CCCF) awarded ($3.1M) for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions
- Newfoundland Power study incentives are approved, and rebates will be received for electrical savings ($306k)
- City of St John’s City Hall Energy Audit 2021 Capital ($100k)
- FCM Feasibility grant submitted, being approved ($200k) to help pay for the very comprehensive feasibility study being completed

Next targeted grant: City of St John’s will also apply for FCM Pathway to NetZero Capital grant, if awarded will provide a 25% grant and a low interest loan retroactively to the project.

With award of FCM’s grant, collective grants will cover 47% of total project cost.
FINANCING THE BASE PROJECT

The base $9.99M project includes tax and all costs and is financed as follows:

- $3,670,427 from grants incentives and other funding as described
- $6,320,236 to be financed from energy performance contract savings in under 15 years from guaranteed utility and other operational costs. City financing will entail a bond, unless the FCM low interest loan is awarded (expected in 8 months) and proves to be a better financing vehicle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Challenge Fund Grant (CCCF)</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$3,110,577 (awarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Energy Audit 2021 Capital</td>
<td>Previously Allocated Capital</td>
<td>$100,000 (approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TakeCHARGE Audit and Feasibility Grants</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$144,000 (awarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM Feasibility Study Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$200,000 (submitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TakeCHARGE retrofit rebates Grants</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$116,000 (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Grants:</td>
<td>$3,670,427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost:</td>
<td>$9,990,664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not including 245 Freshwater Fuel Switching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. John’s Capital:</strong></td>
<td>$6,320,236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINANCING WITH FCM CAPITAL/LOAN AWARDED

The City is applying for the FCM Pathway to NetZero funding project for the Base project scope and for the 245 Freshwater fuel-switching boiler electrification measure.

Consultation with the Honeywell grant pursuit team and the City’s own resources, this FCM grant is looking quite achievable. It includes a 25% grant toward the scope that reduces greenhouse gas emissions. It also provides a low interest loan for the remaining 75% of this scope. See table below for full project financing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Challenge Fund Grant (CCCF)</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$3,110,577 (awarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall Energy Audit 2021 Capital</td>
<td>Previously Allocated Capital</td>
<td>$100,000 (approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TakeCHARGE Audit and Feasibility Grants</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$144,000 (awarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM Feasibility Study Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$200,000 (submitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TakeCHARGE retrofit rebates Grants</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$116,000 (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM Pathway to Net-Zero</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$2,220,544 (TBC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total Grants: $5,890,971

Total Project Cost: $12,552,601

St. John’s Capital (through FCM Pathway to Net-Zero Capital program): $6,661,630
City of St John’s Corporate Climate commitment:
- 40% reduction by 2030 and stretch target of 50% by 2030 from 2018 emissions.
- Net-zero by 2050 at the latest.

The EPC Full Project, will reduce the City’s greenhouse gas emissions by up to 1,118 tonnes CO2eq

- 11% reduction of Corporate GHG emission
- 1/4 of the City’s 2030 Corporate commitment to reduce emissions by 40% from the 2018 baseline;
- With this project, the provincial efforts to implement a low-carbon electricity grid, and improved new city buildings the City is on track to achieve over 70% of its 2030 target before 2025.
- This progress is expected to attract yet more grants

The EPC will further the City’s “leadership by example” role in the implementation of the Resilient St. John’s Community Climate Plan
SOLUTION DEVELOPMENT TEAM
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Title: Mobile Vending on the Parking Lot of Holy Heart High School
Date Prepared: November 22, 2022
Report To: Committee of the Whole
Councillor and Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Transportation & Regulatory Services
Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required: For consideration of Council to permit mobile vending to occur in the parking lot of Holy Heart High School which is zoned Institutional.

Discussion – Background and Current Status: The Regulatory Services Division has been approached by a local community group seeking permission to permit mobile vending to occur on the parking lot described above for an event to take place on January 7 and 8, 2023 from 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

The event is Christmas tree chipping, by donation, to support Jacob Puddister Memorial Foundation which is dedicated to providing mental health resources to youth in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Section 7(2)(b) of the Mobile Vending By-Law states that mobile vending is not permitted in Institutional zones unless specifically permitted by Council.

Key Considerations/Implications:
1. Budget/Financial Implications: N/A
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: N/A
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions: N/A
4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: N/A
5. Accessibility and Inclusion: N/A
6. Legal or Policy Implications: N/A
7. Privacy Implications: N/A
8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: N/A
9. Human Resource Implications: N/A
10. Procurement Implications: N/A
11. Information Technology Implications: N/A
12. Other Implications: N/A

**Recommendation:**

That Council grant permission to allow mobile vending on the parking lot of Holy Heart High School for the aforementioned event.

**Prepared by:**

Randy Carew, CET, Manager, Regulatory Services

Signature: ________________________________

**Approved by:**

Jason Sinyard, P. Eng., MBA, Deputy City Manager, Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services

Signature: ________________________________
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Mobile Vending in Institutional Zone.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Nov 23, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

Jason Sinyard - Nov 23, 2022 - 2:59 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Development Officer’s Decision</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>81655 Newfoundland &amp; Labrador Ltd</td>
<td>Personal Care Home</td>
<td>10 Escasoni Place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>22-12-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Code Classification:
- **RES** - Residential
- **INST** - Institutional
- **COM** - Commercial
- **IND** - Industrial
- **AG** - Agriculture
- **OT** - Other

** This list is issued for information purposes only. Applicants have been advised in writing of the Development Officer’s decision and of their right to appeal any decision to the St. John’s Local Board of Appeal.

Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett  
Supervisor – Planning & Development
## Permits List

### Council's December 12, 2022, Regular Meeting

Permits Issued: 2022/12/01 to 2022/12/07

### BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED

#### Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Faulkner St</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Semi Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Pepperwood Dr</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Victoria St</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Townhousing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 Prowse Ave Exten</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached w/ apt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Riverglen Close</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Townhousing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184 Castle Bridge Dr</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached w/ apt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Paton St</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cape Norman St</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached w/ apt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cheyne Dr</td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Spitfire Dr</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Swimming Pool/Hot Tub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Brad Gushue Cres</td>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>Single Detached w/ apt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Winter Ave</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Winter Ave</td>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>Townhousing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Mackenzie St</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Electra Dr</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Plymouth Rd</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached w/ apt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Pepperwood Dr</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Beothuck St</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Townhousing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>174 Water St</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy/Renovations</td>
<td>Retail Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Nils Way</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Condominium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Peet St</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy/Renovations</td>
<td>Convenience Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672 Topsail Rd</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681 Topsail Rd</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy/Renovations</td>
<td>Commercial Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Battery Rd</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Light Industrial Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Week: $1,643,556.50

This Week: $4,018,500.00
Government/Institutional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
<th>This Week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Industrial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
<th>This Week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demolition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
<th>This Week:</th>
<th>This Week's Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 Maxwell Pl</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$5,677,056.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REPAIR PERMITS ISSUED: $28,000.00

NO REJECTIONS

YEAR TO DATE COMPARISONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>% Variance (+/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$61,122,777.47</td>
<td>$75,849,798.83</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$120,045,820.82</td>
<td>$131,734,436.06</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Institution</td>
<td>$34,894,428.00</td>
<td>$1,980,468.00</td>
<td>-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$4,164,500.00</td>
<td>$351,000.00</td>
<td>-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>$4,766,337.57</td>
<td>$1,732,408.92</td>
<td>-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$224,993,863.86</td>
<td>$211,648,111.81</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units (1 &amp; 2 Family Dwelling)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respectfully Submitted,

_______________________________________
Jason Sinyard, P.Eng., MBA
Deputy City Manager
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
**Weekly Payment Vouchers**  
**For The**  
**Week Ending December 7, 2022**

**Payroll**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>$549,662.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Weekly Administration</td>
<td>$854,370.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Weekly Management</td>
<td>$933,609.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Weekly Fire Department</td>
<td>$908,179.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accounts Payable**  
$3,672,349.56

*(A detailed breakdown [here](#))*

**Total:** $6,918,170.97
### DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Demolition of Dwelling – 276 Freshwater Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Prepared:</td>
<td>December 6, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report To:</td>
<td>Regular Meeting of Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor and Role:</td>
<td>Councillor Maggie Burton, Transportation &amp; Regulatory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>Ward 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decision/Direction Required:** For consideration of council to grant a Demolition Order of 276 Freshwater Road.

**Discussion – Background and Current Status:** The building situated at 276 Freshwater Road sustained severe damage due to a fire which renders the building uninhabitable and is causing a potential safety concern. A notice has been issued to the property owner but it has not been complied with and no response has been received.

Inspection Services Division has boarded up dwelling since the fire on a couple of occasions due to unauthorized access, etc.

Due to its condition there is growing concern from area residents regarding the potential hazard this property is creating not to mention the unsightliness of the property.
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications:

   Should the City proceed with the order and if it is not complied with, a tender document will be developed for the demolition of the property. The cost associated with this demolition and associated repairs to the adjacent attached dwellings will be applied to the subject property.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: N/A

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions: N/A

   Choose an item.

   Choose an item.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: NA

5. Accessibility and Inclusion: N/A

6. Legal or Policy Implications: N/A

7. Privacy Implications: N/A

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: N/A

9. Human Resource Implications: N/A

10. Procurement Implications: N/A

11. Information Technology Implications: N/A

12. Other Implications: N/A

Recommendation:

That Council grant the Demolition Order of 276 Freshwater Road.

Prepared by:
Randy Carew, CET – Manager – Regulatory Services

Signature: ________________________________
Approved by:
Jason Sinyard, P. Eng., MBA – Deputy City Manager – Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services

Signature: ________________________________
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>276 Freshwater Road - Demolition Order.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

Jason Sinyard - Dec 6, 2022 - 3:06 PM
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Art Procurement 2022
Date Prepared: December 5, 2022
Report To: Regular Meeting of Council
Councillor and Role: Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O’Leary, Arts & Culture
Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required: Approval of the 2022 Art Procurement jury’s recommendation to Council regarding purchase of artwork submitted to the 2022 Art Procurement program.

Discussion – Background and Current Status: The Art Procurement program considers submissions by individual artists and commercial art galleries for purchase by the City and subsequent inclusion in the Civic Art Collection. Pieces in the Civic Art Collection are on display throughout City Hall and other City buildings, in offices, boardrooms, public spaces, etc. These artworks are also regularly displayed in Wyatt Hall as a part of seasonal or themed exhibitions intended to share the collection with the general public and encourage engagement with the visual arts.

This year in response to the call for submissions, there were 170 pieces submitted for consideration, from 65 artists. Each artist can submit up to three pieces for consideration.

The jury for the Art Procurement program is comprised of subject matter experts in the area of visual art: practicing artists, art teachers, art writers, curators, and/or other persons knowledgeable in the area of visual art.

The jury met virtually on December 5, 2022 and selected twenty-one (21) pieces for purchase (please see attached list), totaling $19,600. The annual budget for Art Procurement is $20,000.

Upon approval, agreements will be signed between the City and the selected artists and/or the commercial gallery representing them, and the selected artworks will be delivered to the City Archives for cataloguing and inclusion in the Civic Art Collection.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: The 2022 budget includes $20,000 for the purchase of artwork through the Art Procurement program. The jury has recommended the purchase of artwork totaling $19,600.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: City staff worked with an external jury to assess and select artworks to be recommended for purchase.
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

A Connected City: Increase and improve opportunities for residents to connect with each other and the City.

A Connected City: Develop and deliver programs, services and public spaces that build safe, healthy and vibrant communities.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: Planning for a Creative Future: The City of St. John’s Municipal Arts Plan

5. Accessibility and Inclusion: N/A

6. Legal or Policy Implications: Selected artists and/or the commercial galleries representing them will enter into an agreement with the City.

7. Privacy Implications: N/A

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: The Call for Submissions was promoted through City channels, and Economic Development, Culture and Partnership and Communications staff will work to determine the most appropriate means through which an announcement concerning the selected pieces may be shared.

9. Human Resource Implications: N/A

10. Procurement Implications: Once approved, the artworks selected by the Jury will be acquired for inclusion in the Civic Art Collection.

11. Information Technology Implications: N/A

12. Other Implications: N/A

Recommendation:
That Council approve the 2022 Art Procurement Jury’s recommendations for purchase as attached.

Prepared by: Théa Morash, Arts & Cultural Development Coordinator

Approved by:
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Art Procurement 2022.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>2022 Art Procurement - Artworks Recommended for Purchase.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

Elizabeth Lawrence - Dec 6, 2022 - 1:37 PM

Tanya Haywood - Dec 6, 2022 - 2:08 PM
# Artworks Recommended for Purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aiden, Nicholas</td>
<td>Earth</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apel, Luca Jesse</td>
<td>Through the Looking Glass</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Batten, Chris</td>
<td>Spring Fog, Spring Hill</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Deeley, Lori</td>
<td>Grand Lake</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dominix, Luanne</td>
<td>Hook, Line, and Sinker</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dwyer, Shane</td>
<td>Ghost Rig</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gosse, Marcus</td>
<td>Republic City Energy</td>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gosse, Marcus</td>
<td>Spiritual Journey, Arctic Char</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Greeley, Kym</td>
<td>You Are The One</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ivanova, Sophia</td>
<td>Too Much At a Time</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Leyton, Bonnie</td>
<td>Lobster</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lewis, Julie</td>
<td>Slice of Ragged Cake</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Makaremi Nia, Nasim</td>
<td>Secret Code #2</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Murphy, Theresa</td>
<td>Late Morning Plans</td>
<td>$440.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>O'Reilly, Jill</td>
<td>Dogberries</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pelley, Rhonda</td>
<td>White Horses</td>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pittman, Emily</td>
<td>Terra Cotta</td>
<td>$1,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sakhno, Lu</td>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Skidmore, Jamie</td>
<td>Skipper - Folk Art</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Song, Ginok</td>
<td>Moon Light</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Young, Jennifer</td>
<td>Tidal Pool</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 19,600.44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2022 ART PROCUREMENT
Artworks recommended for purchase

Aiden, Nicholas
Earth
Acrylic print

Apel, Luca Jesse
Through the Looking Glass
Mixed media, basswood, acrylics

Batten, Chris
Spring Fog, Spring Hill
Reduction woodcut

Deely, Lori
Grand Lake
Watercolour

Dominix, Luanne
Hook, Line, and Sinker
Watercolour on paper
Dwyer, Shane
Ghost Rig
Oil & ink on canvas

Gosse, Marcus
Spiritual Journey, Arctic Char
Acrylic on canvas

Gosse, Marcus
Republic City Energy
Acrylic on canvas

Greeley, Kym
You Are the One
Serigraphy

Ivanova, Sophia
Too Much At a Time
Acrylic and varnish on canvas

Lewis, Julie
Slice of Ragged Cake
Acrylic on canvas
Leyton, Bonnie
Lobster
Oil on canvas

Makaremi Nia, Nasim
Secret Code #2
Pencil on paper

Murphy, Theresa
Late Morning Plans
Reduction linocut print

O'Reilly, Jill
Dogberries
Stained glass mosaic

Pelley, Rhonda
White Horses
Archival inkjet print

Pittman, Emily
Terra Cotta
Acrylic & house paint on panel
Sakhno, Lu
Immersion
Acrylic on canvas

Skidmore, Jamie
Skipper – Folk Art
Hand-carved & painted marionette

Song, Ginok
Moon Light
Oil on canvas

Young, Jennifer
Tidal Pool
Encaustic & mixed media on board