Regular Meeting - City Council
Agenda

February 6, 2023
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

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

6. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS
   6.1 Notices Published – 607 Topsail Road - DEV2200179
   6.2 Notices Published – 35 Major’s Path - DEV2200154
   6.3 Notices Published – 254 Pennywell Road - DEV2200174
   6.4 Development in the Floodplain Buffer - 716 Water Street – DEV2200111

7. RATIFICATION OF EPOLLS

8. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   8.1 Post Meeting Report - Committee of the Whole - January 25, 2023
      1. Procurement Threshold Increase
      2. Rate Increase Instructors and Work Term Students
3. Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund Purchase – SCADA Software Upgrade at the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Plant

4. Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund Purchase – Clarifier Collector Replacement at the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Plant

5. Traffic Calming Policy Update (January 18, 2023) Re: Public Survey Component

PLEASE REFER TO ITEM 8.1.5.1 BELOW CONTAINING THE FULLY MERGED DECISION NOTE ON TRAFFIC CALMING POLICY FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Traffic Calming Policy Update (February 6, 2023)

FULL REPORT OF RECOMMENDATIONS

9. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

10. BUILDING PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

10.1 Building Permits List

11. REQUISITIONS, PAYROLLS AND ACCOUNTS

11.1 Weekly Payment Vouchers Week Ending February 1, 2023

12. TENDERS/RFPS

12.1 Supply Clarifier Collector Equipment for the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF).

13. NOTICES OF MOTION, RESOLUTIONS QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

13.1 Notice of Motion - Codes of Conduct for Councillors and Municipal Officials

Notice of Motion to adopt the Codes of Conduct for Councillors and Municipal Officials

14. OTHER BUSINESS

14.1 CERAWEEK – 2023 – Houston, Texas

15. ACTION ITEMS RAISED BY COUNCIL
16. ADJOURNMENT
Minutes of Regular Meeting - City Council
Council Chamber, 4th Floor, City Hall

January 30, 2023, 3:00 p.m.

Present: Mayor Danny Breen
         Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O'Leary
         Councillor Maggie Burton
         Councillor Jill Bruce
         Councillor Ophelia Ravencroft
         Councillor Jamie Korab
         Councillor Ian Froude
         Councillor Carl Ridgeley

Regrets: Councillor Ron Ellsworth
         Councillor Sandy Hickman
         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
         Susan Bonnell, Manager, Communications & Office Services
         Ken O'Brien, Chief Municipal Planner
         Karen Chafe, City Clerk
         Christine Carter, Legislative Assistant
         Jennifer Squires, Legislative Assistant
         Stacey Corbett, Legislative Assistant

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

2. PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS
   2.1 Proclamation for Winter iWALK
   2.2 Proclamation for Eating Disorders Awareness Week

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
   3.1 Adoption of Agenda
      SJMC-R-2023-01-30/33
      Moved By Councillor Ravencroft
      Seconded By Councillor Bruce

      That the Agenda be adopted as presented.

      For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Burton, 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 - January 23, 2023
      SJMC-R-2023-01-30/34
      Moved By Deputy Mayor O’Leary
      Seconded By Councillor Korab

      That the minutes of January 23, 2023, be adopted as presented.

      For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley
MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

5.1 St. John’s Heritage Designation Amendment (Presentation Convent - 180 Military Road) By-Law

By-law to remove the heritage designation for the rear portion of 180 Military Road

SJMC-R-2023-01-30/35
Moved By Councillor Burton
Seconded By Councillor Ridgeley

That the following By-Law be adopted:

BY-LAW NO.

1. ST. JOHN’S HERITAGE DESIGNATION AMENDMENT (PRESENTATION CONVENT - 180 MILITARY ROAD) BY-LAW

PASSED BY COUNCIL ON

Pursuant to the powers vested in it under section 355 of the City of St. John’s Act, RSNL 1990 c. C-17, as amended and all other powers enabling it, the City of St. John’s enacts the following By-Law relating to the heritage designation of the Presentation Convent - 180 Military Road

BY-LAW

1. This by-law may be cited as the St. John’s Heritage Designation Amendment (Presentation Convent – 180 Military Road) By-Law.

2. The Heritage Building designation is removed from the long rear extension of the Presentation Convent – 180 Military Road – Parcel ID #46428.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF the Seal of the City of St. John’s has been hereunto affixed and this By-Law has been signed by the Mayor and City Clerk this ____ day of _________________, 2023.

MAYOR

CITY CLERK

For (5): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O’Leary, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Korab, and Councillor Ridgeley

Against (2): Councillor Burton, and Councillor Froude

Abstain (1): Councillor Ravencroft

MOTION CARRIED (5 to 2)

5.2 Notice of Motion - Removal of 375 Waterford Bridge from Future Development

Councillor Ravencroft stated that she cannot support this motion as she believes it is important to keep all potential sites available for development due to the rising need for affordable housing.

SJMC-R-2023-01-30/36

Moved By Councillor Ridgeley
Seconded By Councillor Korab

That St. John’s Municipal Council remove 375 Waterford Bridge Road from the list of parcels of land identified and approved by Council, at the March 8, 2021 Regular Meeting of Council, as potential sites for affordable
housing developments in advance of planned developments on those sites.

For (6): Mayor Breen, Councillor Burton, Councillor Bruce, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

Against (2): Deputy Mayor O'Leary, and Councillor Ravencroft

MOTION CARRIED (6 to 2)

6. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

6.1 Request to Set Parking Requirement for an Institutional Use – 10 St. Clare Avenue – INT2300004

SJMC-R-2023-01-30/37

Moved By Councillor Korab
Seconded By Deputy Mayor O'Leary

That Council set two (2) parking spaces for the proposed Institutional Use (emergency shelter) at 10 St. Clare Avenue.

For (8): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, 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 January 19 to 25, 2023

10. BUILDING PERMITS LIST (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

10.1 Building Permits List

11. REQUISITIONS, PAYROLLS AND ACCOUNTS

11.1 Weekly Payment Vouchers for the Week Ending January 25, 2023
Moved By Deputy Mayor O'Leary  
Seconded By Councillor Ravencroft  

That the weekly payment vouchers for the week ending January 25, 2023, in the amount of $2,992,451.02, be approved as presented.

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

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

12. TENDERS/RFPS  
13. NOTICES OF MOTION, RESOLUTIONS QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS  
14. OTHER BUSINESS  
14.1 Inclusion Advisory Committee (IAC) Approval of New Members  

Moved By Councillor Ravencroft  
Seconded By Deputy Mayor O'Leary  

That Council approve the following individuals to serve on the Inclusion Advisory Committee:

Kim White – Universal Design Representative  
Lisa Zigler – Women’s Representative  

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

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

14.2 Seniors Advisory Committee – Committee Membership Approvals
Moved By Councillor Bruce  
Seconded By Councillor Froude

That Council accept the recommendation to extend the terms of Ms. Sharron Callahan and Mr. Gordon Kirby on the Seniors Advisory Committee, for another two years, and to approve the organizational appointments of Mr. Al Skehan and Mr. David Budden.

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

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

14.3 Lease of City land at the rear of 14 George Street, fronting on Duckworth Street

Moved By Councillor Ravencroft  
Seconded By Councillor Bruce

That Council approve the lease of City land at the rear of 14 George Street, fronting on Duckworth Street, as shown in red on the attached diagram.

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

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

14.4 Lease of City land at the rear of 306 Water Street, fronting on George Street

Moved By Councillor Ravencroft  
Seconded By Deputy Mayor O'Leary

That Council approve the Lease of the City owned land at the rear of 306 Water Street, fronting on George Street, as shown in the attached survey.
14.5 **Lease of City land in front of 38 Gower Street**

SJMC-R-2023-01-30/43  
**Moved By** Councillor Ravencroft  
**Seconded By** Deputy Mayor O'Leary

That Council approve of the lease of City land adjacent to 38 Gower Street for the installation of a planter box, as shown in the attached diagram.

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

**MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**

14.6 **Quit Claim Deed – City claimed land in front of 1168 Portugal Cove Road**

SJMC-R-2023-01-30/44  
**Moved By** Councillor Bruce  
**Seconded By** Councillor Ravencroft

That Council approve the quit claim for land claimed by the City in front of 1168 Portugal Cove Road, located in the Town of Portugal Cove-St. Philips

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

**MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)**
Moved By Councillor Ravencroft
Seconded By Councillor Bruce

That Council approve the sale of City land adjacent to 1 Duckworth Street, as shown on the attached survey.

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

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

14.8 10 Barrows Road, Development Adjacent to Heritage Building, DEM2200027

Moved By Councillor Froude
Seconded By Councillor Ravencroft

That Council approve renovations to re-instate the east façade of Mallard Cottage at 8 Barrows Road, a designated Heritage Building, following demolition of the building at 10 Barrows Road.

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

MOTION CARRIED (8 to 0)

15. ACTION ITEMS RAISED BY COUNCIL

Deputy Mayor O'Leary brought forth an offer from William Montevacchi to conduct a presentation regarding extraneous night lighting and its influence on the environment at a Committee of the Whole meeting. This will be referred to staff for consideration.

16. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:41.

__________________________________________
MAYOR

__________________________________________
CITY CLERK
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Notices Published – 607 Topsail Road - DEV2200179

Date Prepared: January 31, 2023

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 for 607 Topsail Road.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The application is a Home Occupation for a Registered Massage Therapy practice. The treatment room is within the Dwelling and has an area of 11.7 square meters. Hours of operation are Monday and Thursday from 12pm to 8pm, Tuesday and Wednesday from 8am to 4pm, Friday from 9:30am to 4pm, and Saturday from 9am to 5pm. The business will have one employee. Parking provided on site. The proposed application site is in the Residential 1 (R1) Zone.

No submissions were received.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Property owner and neighboring 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.

   Choose an item.


5. Accessibility and Inclusion: Not applicable.
6. Legal or Policy Implications: St. John’s Development Regulations Section 6.18 “Home Occupation”, Section 10.5 “Discretionary Uses” and Section 10 “Residential 1 (R1) 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 for a Home Occupation at 607 Topsail Road to allow a registered massage therapy practice.

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 - 607 Topsail Road.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- DEV2200179-607 TOPSAIL ROAD.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 1, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - Jan 31, 2023 - 3:20 PM**

**Jason Sinyard - Feb 1, 2023 - 11:33 AM**
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Notices Published – 35 Major’s Path - DEV2200154

Date Prepared: January 31, 2023

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 1

Decision/Direction Required:
A Discretionary Use application has been submitted by Morgan Enterprises Limited for 35 Major’s Path.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The proposed application is for a Clinic Use that will have a floor area of approximately 1100m². A new building is proposed onsite with 20 clinic rooms and contains both Clinic and Office uses. Hours of operation will be Monday to Saturday, 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. The proposed development will conform to the Industrial Commercial (IC) Zone requirements and parking will be provided. Layout and Design will be subject to all City specifications at the time of development. The proposed application site is zoned Industrial Commercial (IC).

One submission was received, which requested more information on the site, location of the new building and plans to address parking, as the current parking lot fills quickly and there was concern that the overflow parking might extend into the neighbourhood.

The proposed building will be located toward the back of the site, between the two existing buildings. No demolition of existing buildings is proposed at this time. The overall property is being expanded; vacant land at the rear of the property is being consolidated with the current Lot. New parking will be added to accommodate the new building and is subject to the St. John’s Development Regulations parking requirements.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Property owner and neighboring 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 10.5 “Discretionary Use” and Section 10 “Industrial Commercial (IC) 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 for a Clinic at 35 Major’s Path.

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 - 35 Major's Path.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- DEV2200154-35 MAJOR'S PATH.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 1, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - Jan 31, 2023 - 3:26 PM**

**Jason Sinyard - Feb 1, 2023 - 11:30 AM**
Hello,

My name is [redacted]. Today I received a letter in the mail regarding a new Clinic that is being built on 35 Majors path and I had a few questions.

I was wondering if the existing building is being demolished, or is a new building being built adjacent to the existing? If the existing building is not being demolished, I would like to know what plans are in place to address the additional parking that will be required for the new building. Will the new building be built in the parking lot of the existing building?

Currently, the parking lot of 35 Major’s Path fills up during the day. I’m concerned that if this new building results in less parking spaces for the facilities that people will start parking in our neighbourhood.

Please let me know if you can provide any more details regarding the exact location of the new Clinic, and if you can provide information on the parking situation once the new building is complete.

Thank you,

[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone
DEcision/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Notices Published – 254 Pennywell Road - DEV2200174

Date Prepared: January 31, 2023

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required:
A Change of Non-Conforming Use application has been submitted by Kearsey’s Guitar Works for 254 Pennywell Road.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
The proposed application is to change the existing Service Shop and Retail Use from the sharpening of skates and retail (The Sports Shack) to the repair of musical instruments and retail sales. Hours of operation will be Monday to Saturday, 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. There will be one employee and the floor area of the business will remain at 58m² (approximately). On-site parking is provided. The proposed application site is zoned Residential 2 (R2).

Subject to Section 7.5, a Non-Conforming Use “may have the existing Use varied with the approval of Council to a Use that is more compatible, in Council’s opinion, with the Municipal Plan and these Regulations”. The proposed Use remains as Service Shop and Retail, while the business within is changing from skate sharpening and retail to the repair of musical instruments and retail.

One submission was received, which raised concerns regarding after hours noise related to the repair of musical equipment and the associated business traffic in a residential area, including foot traffic.

The hours of operation advertised will make up part of the Development Agreement, which the applicant must adhere to. All business operations would need to occur within the approved hours and should the hours change, a revised application would be required. The City’s Noise By-Law would also be applicable. Onsite parking is provided for the business. The applicant notes that the shop is mostly a repair spot with limited noise. Noise levels are predicted to be lower than the previous skate sharpening business; acoustic guitars are moderately quiet, while any electric instruments would be at a very respectable volume for testing purposes.
Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Property owner and neighboring 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.

Choose an item.


5. Accessibility and Inclusion: Not applicable.

6. Legal or Policy Implications: St. John’s Development Regulations Section 7.5 “Non-Conforming” and Section 10 “Residential 2 (R2) Zone”.

7. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: 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 Change of Non-Conforming Use application for a Service Shop and Retail Use for the repair of musical instruments and retail sales at 254 Pennywell 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 - 254 Pennywell Road.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- DEV2200174-254 PENNYWELL ROAD.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 1, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett - Jan 31, 2023 - 3:32 PM**

**Jason Sinyard - Feb 1, 2023 - 11:30 AM**
Hello,

My name is [REDACTED] and I live at [REDACTED Address].

I am replying back to the correspondence I received today January 12, 2023 to express our concerns about the application for a change of non-conforming use for 254 Pennywell road.

Our concerns include the following:

1. After hours noise in the repair of musical equipment

While the stated business hours are 10 - 6 Monday - Saturday, we are concerned about repairs being completed to musical equipment outside those business hours involving tuning, testing, banging of drums, playing of guitars & bass or running of electrical devices (amplifiers).

As we have [REDACTED] we are very worried about not only the disturbance of noise in general we may hear, but also the noise level itself.

What is the accepted level of noise of such a business in a residential area?

We cannot have musical instruments playing after 6 [REDACTED]

Nor can we have loud sounds disrupting the home in the late nor early hours of the morning.

In fact if this business is to operate at all it cannot disrupt our peaceful enjoyment of our home.

Noise level must be reduced and kept to a minimum.

2. Business traffic in a residential area

The skate shop operators exercised great consideration for the amount of noise and disruption that was created by their clientele, which in general was minimal.

However, we are concerned about the amount of foot traffic in and around this new shop as it will utilize retail space as well.

This will differentiate it mostly from the skate shop whose sole business was the sharpening of skates where clients simply dropped & picked up skates to be sharpened by appointment.

This could potentially impact us [REDACTED]
So again any noise or disruption must be kept to a minimum as it is a residential area with [redacted] but there are surrounding homes with elderly retirees.

Outside of these concerns, if this musical equipment repair shop can keep to the same practices as the previous skate shop, both during and after hours and reduce/minimize the noise level from testing of equipment then that should be acceptable.

Thank you,

Sent from my iPhone
Title: Development in the Floodplain Buffer - 716 Water Street – DEV2200111

Date Prepared: February 1, 2023

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required: To consider approval for servicing of a private Development within the Floodplain Buffer at 716 Water Street.

Discussion – Background and Current Status: An application was received for a Building extension, along with parking lot and stormwater collection system upgrades at 716 Water Street. The developer is proposing to expand and upgrade the parking lot, along with new curb, catch basins and storm pipe network. The storm pipe is proposed to cross Water Street and discharge into the Waterford River and is proposed to be located within the Floodplain Buffer. Under Section 4.10(4), Council may permit “servicing of a private Development” within the Floodplain Buffer.

Subject to Section 4.10(6), prior to Council’s consideration the application was referred to the Environment and Sustainability Experts Panel for their consideration. The panel has no concerns with the proposed application.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Not applicable.

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 4.10(4) and (6) “Waterways, Wetlands, Ponds or Lakes”.

7. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not applicable.

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 servicing of a private development within the Floodplain Buffer at 716 Water Street.

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>Development Committee - Development in Floodplain Buffer - 716 Water Street - DEV2200111.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- DEV2200111-716 WATER STREET.pdf&lt;br&gt;- 716 Water St.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 2, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Jason Sinyard - Feb 2, 2023 - 3:04 PM
SUBJECT PROPERTY
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IG
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WATER ST
CITY OF ST. JOHN'S

w:\engwork\plan\applications 2022\dev2200111-716 water street.mxd
Report of Committee of the Whole - City Council

Council Chambers, 4th Floor, City Hall

January 25, 2023, 9:30 a.m.

Present: Mayor Danny Breen
Deputy Mayor Sheilagh O'Leary
Councillor Maggie Burton
Councillor Ron Ellsworth
Councillor Sandy Hickman
Councillor Ophelia Ravencroft
Councillor Jamie Korab
Councillor Ian Froude
Councillor Carl Ridgeley

Regrets: Councillor Debbie Hanlon
Councillor Jill Bruce

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
Ken O'Brien, Chief Municipal Planner
Karen Chafe, City Clerk
Christine Carter, Legislative Assistant

Others: Kelly Maguire, Communications and Public Relations Officer
Amer Afridi, Manager - Transportation Engineering
Scott Winsor, Director – Engineering
Judy Tobin, Manager – Housing
Leslie O'Brien, Manager – City Buildings, Public Works
Kyle Kearsey, Supervisor – City Buildings, Public Works
1. Procurement Threshold Increase

Recommendation
Moved By Councillor Ellsworth
Seconded By Councillor Froude

That Council approve an increase to the procurement threshold for when three quotes are required from $1,000 to $2,500.

For (9): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (9 to 0)

2. Rate Increase Instructors and Work Term Students

Recommendation
Moved By Councillor Ellsworth
Seconded By Deputy Mayor O'Leary

That Council increase the hourly wage of instructors and work term students as recommended and that they be reviewed on an annual basis or in line with changes to the minimum wage as required.

For (9): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (9 to 0)

3. Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund Purchase – SCADA Software Upgrade at the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Plant

Recommendation
Moved By Councillor Hickman
Seconded By Councillor Ellsworth
That Council approve access to funding from the Regional Wastewater Reserve to support this purchase.

For (9): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (9 to 0)

4. Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund Purchase – Clarifier Collector Replacement at the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Plant

Recommendation

Moved By Councillor Hickman
Seconded By Councillor Burton

That Council approve access to funding from the Regional Wastewater Reserve to support this purchase.

For (9): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (9 to 0)

5. Traffic Calming Policy Update (January 18, 2023)

Councillor Burton presented the Traffic Calming Policy update.

Concerns were raised regarding the low threshold for the minimum response rate, which works out to be at least 24% approval from overall residents, required to generate the implementation of permanent traffic calming measures. It was advised that this threshold is currently higher than the number of responses the City is currently receiving from residents.

Following discussion, Council was satisfied that this threshold, combined with the initial petition requirement and lived experience with temporary traffic calming measures will provide sufficient awareness within neighborhoods to encourage the required feedback should residents wish to do so. Those who do not respond will be considered to have a neutral opinion. Communication will also
be important to try and reach the threshold target. Ideas will be looked at to help make public engagement easier for residents.

Recommendation
Moved By Councillor Burton
Seconded By Councillor Froude

That Council:
1. Keep the resident survey;
2. Set a target minimum response rate for the Traffic Calming public survey to be 40% of households surveyed by 2026 and require the support of at least “60% of the responding households” to implement permanent traffic calming.

For (9): Mayor Breen, Deputy Mayor O'Leary, Councillor Burton, Councillor Ellsworth, Councillor Hickman, Councillor Ravencroft, Councillor Korab, Councillor Froude, and Councillor Ridgeley

MOTION CARRIED (9 to 0)

_________________________
Mayor
Title: Procurement Threshold Increase

Date Prepared: January 11, 2023

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor and Role: Councillor Ron Ellsworth, Finance & Administration

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required: Approval to increase the procurement threshold for when three quotes are required from $1,000 to $2,500.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

The City’s procurement policy lays out what is required on the part of staff to acquire goods/services. As the dollar value of the procurement increases so does the necessary work to try and ensure best value for money. Current policy is as follows:

1. For items less than $1,000 a direct purchase can be made
2. For items between $1,000 and $2,500 three quotes are required (can include online listings / catalogues)
3. For items between $2,500 and $10,000 three written quotes supplied by vendors are required

It is important to note that best value for money – in accordance with the public procurement act – is not always lowest cost. Other factors such as quality of items purchased and lead times to acquiring them impact value. Lead times to acquiring goods / services – particularly in vehicle maintenance, and the acquisition of professional services are being particularly impacted by the requirement to get quotes for purchases over $1,000. Based on the experience of the Supply Chain Division and feedback from various City departments it was questioned whether a move to quotes only being required for purchases in excess of $2,500 was practical.

The process of getting quotes often involves a lot of time spent searching for suppliers who stock the item or waiting for a vendor to respond with a quote. While this seems simple, often the process can take days and includes the administration work of emailing / phone calls / storing the quotes, and related work. More importantly however it often has a negative impact on the City’s fleet division when repairs are being made to the city’s snow clearing or garbage collection vehicles and the equipment is inoperable due to waiting on quotes for parts to complete necessary repairs.
To provide some context of the volume of activity the purchasing activity between $1,000 and $2,500 over the past three years has been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># POs</th>
<th>$ Value</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>$2,583,135</td>
<td>$1,576.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>$2,465,711</td>
<td>$1,579.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>$2,396,833</td>
<td>$1,593.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>$2,481,893</td>
<td>$1,583.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table however includes items which would already be on contract and thus not require three quotes anyway. Extracting those POs leaves the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Pos</th>
<th>$ Value</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>$1,162,411</td>
<td>$1,575.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>$1,109,570</td>
<td>$1,580.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>$1,078,575</td>
<td>$1,593.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>$1,116,852</td>
<td>$1,582.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows on average that based on 700 purchase orders 2,100 quotes were sought for total purchases of just over $1.1M. The impact of not requiring three quotes for purchases up to $2,500 would only impact a very small amount of overall city purchasing but the operational impact could likely be significant. Removing 2,100 quotes from the procurement process will allow for more timely procurement of goods/services, allow more time to be spent on larger purchases, and improve the operations of city departments who serve taxpayers directly.

Staff also reached out to other jurisdictions and found out that the dollar value before three quotes are required for the City of Mount Pearl and the Provincial Government are $2,000 and $2,500 respectively.

**Key Considerations/Implications:**

1. Budget/Financial Implications: No material budget implications
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:
   - A Sustainable City: Be financially responsible and accountable.
   - An Effective City: Work with our employees to improve organizational performance through effective processes and policies.
4. Alignment with Adopted Plans:
5. Accessibility and Inclusion:

6. Legal or Policy Implications: There are no implications or contradictions with the Public Procurement Act.

7. Privacy Implications:

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations:

9. Human Resource Implications:

10. Procurement Implications: This will allow buyers and other staff to focus more effort on high value purchasing.

11. Information Technology Implications:

12. Other Implications:

**Recommendation:**
That Council approve an increase the procurement threshold for when three quotes are required from $1,000 to $2,500.

**Prepared by:**
**Approved by:** Derek Coffey
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Increase Purchasing Thresholds.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Jan 12, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Rick Squires - Jan 12, 2023 - 7:41 PM**

**Derek Coffey - Jan 12, 2023 - 9:20 PM**
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Rate increase instructors and workterm students

Date Prepared: January 25, 2023

Report To: Special Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Ron Ellsworth, Finance & Administration

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:
To increase the hourly wage of instructors and workterm students to align with rates being paid by other municipalities and businesses (in the market).

Discussion – Background and Current Status:
There has been no increase for these positions since 2011. Research has been undertaken to compare rates with other municipalities and businesses. As a result the following rates are recommended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Instructor I</td>
<td>$15.84</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Instructor II</td>
<td>$18.14</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>$5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Long Learners</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness I</td>
<td>$20.08</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>$4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness II</td>
<td>$21.95</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>$3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op Students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Term 1</td>
<td>$15.18</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>$0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Term 2</td>
<td>$17.25</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Term 3</td>
<td>$18.77</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Term 4</td>
<td>$19.33</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>$1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Term 5</td>
<td>$20.63</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Term 6</td>
<td>$22.89</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>$1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The co-op student rate increases each year by 8.5%. The large variation in the increases is due to the time since which rates have been reviewed as well as current market factors.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Cost increase will be approximately $21,000.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: N/A
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

   An Effective City: Work with our employees to improve organizational performance through effective processes and policies.

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: To attract and retain qualified students and employees.

10. Procurement Implications: N/A

11. Information Technology Implications: N/A

12. Other Implications: N/A

Recommendation:
That Council increase the hourly wage of instructors and workterm students as recommended and that they be reviewed on an annual basis or in line with changes to the minimum wage as required.

Prepared by: Leanne Piccott, Manager, HR Advisory Services
Approved by: Tanya Haywood, DCM Community Services
Title: Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund Purchase – SCADA Software Upgrade at the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Plant

Date Prepared: January 12, 2023

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor and Role: Councillor Sandy Hickman, Public Works

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:
To seek a decision on proceeding with the purchase of a SCADA software upgrade funded through the Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

The Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund is being requested to be used for the purchase of a SCADA software upgrade at the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Plant. The software package is used for treatment plant process monitoring, control, data trending, and historical data archiving. The software package currently in use has reached the end of its life and must be upgraded. The software upgrade is estimated to cost $100,000.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications:

   The Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Plant has identified sufficient funds within the Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund to support this software upgrade with $1,900,000 remaining in reserve.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:

   The City of St. John’s, the City of Mount Pearl and the Town of Paradise.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

   An Effective City: Ensure accountability and good governance through transparent and open decision making.
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:
    The estimated timeframe for the delivery and implementation of this software upgrade is approximately 12 weeks.

11. Information Technology Implications: N/A

12. Other Implications: N/A

Recommendation:
That Council approve access to funding from the Regional Wastewater Reserve to support this purchase.

Prepared by: Daniel Martin, Manager – Regional Facilities
Approved by:
### Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund Purchase - SCADA Software Upgrade at the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Plant.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Jan 16, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- **Andrew Niblock** - Jan 12, 2023 - 12:34 PM
- **Lynnann Winsor** - Jan 16, 2023 - 12:33 PM
Title: Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund Purchase – Clarifier Collector Replacement at the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Plant

Date Prepared: January 12, 2023

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor and Role: Councillor Sandy Hickman, Public Works

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:

To seek a decision on proceeding with the purchase of replacement clarifier collectors funded through the Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

The Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Plant operates three primary clarifiers for settling and removal of wastewater solids. The clarifier collectors are required to remove solids from the clarifiers. The collectors in clarifier #2 have reached the end of their life and require replacement. The Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund is being requested to be used for the supply and installation of replacement collectors for clarifier #2. This equipment replacement is estimated to cost $500,000.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications:

   The Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Plant has identified sufficient funds within the Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund to support this purchase with $1,900,000 remaining in reserve.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:

   The City of St. John’s, the City of Mount Pearl, and the Town of Paradise.

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

   An Effective City: Ensure accountability and good governance through transparent and open decision making.
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:  
    The estimated timeframe for the delivery and installation of this equipment is approximately 25 weeks.

11. Information Technology Implications:  
    N/A

12. Other Implications:  
    N/A

**Recommendation:**  
That Council approve access to funding from the Regional Wastewater Reserve to support this purchase.

**Prepared by:** Daniel Martin, Manager – Regional Facilities  
**Approved by:**
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Regional Wastewater Reserve Fund Purchase – Clarifier Collector Replacement at the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Plant.docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Jan 19, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Andrew Niblock** - Jan 12, 2023 - 4:43 PM

**No Signature** - Task assigned to Lynnann Winsor was completed by workflow administrator Karen Chafe

**Lynnann Winsor** - Jan 19, 2023 - 10:47 AM
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Traffic Calming Policy Update (January 18, 2023)
Date Prepared: January 18, 2023
Report To: Committee of the Whole
Councillor and Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Transportation & Regulatory Services
Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:
Council has reviewed and discussed proposed changes to the City’s Current Traffic Calming Policy. The proposed changes presented in the “Traffic Calming Policy Update (November 30, 2022)” Decision Note were supported by Council at the November 30, 2022 Committee of the Whole meeting. At the December 12, 2022 Council Meeting, a motion was passed to bring this decision note back to Committee of the Whole for further discussion regarding the resident survey as some councilors suggested removing the survey from the policy.

The following discussion pertains to the resident survey process of the proposed Traffic Calming policy update only and does not replicate the entire contents of the November 30, 2022 decision note. Once staff receives direction from Council on these outstanding matters, all of the updated recommendations will be consolidated and referred to Council.

Public Survey: Public participation is an important part of successfully implementing permanent traffic calming measures in neighborhoods. The final step in the proposed updated traffic calming process is to survey residents of the street and ask them to provide input on the temporary traffic calming measures that were installed as a trial on their street. It would be the only survey completed by the City during the process and would be distributed to all residents of the street giving everyone an opportunity to determine how the project proceeds. It would also be the only opportunity for a resident to express opposition to a project within the formal process. During public engagement on this policy update, 86% of survey participants were in favour of the City conducting and distributing this survey.

According to the 2011 Policy, 60% of the affected residents would need “yes” vote to move to permanent implementation. In practice, this requirement for the public survey was changed to “60% of those who responded to the survey”. This provision assigns a “neutral” opinion to residents that do not respond. Previous review recommended to formalize this current practice (DN March 2021).
Is Council’s concern that a street that qualifies for traffic calming under the policy is inherently unsafe and therefore traffic calming measures should be undertaken regardless of resident input? If so it should be noted the Traffic Calming Policy does not necessarily determine whether a street is unsafe. The Traffic Calming Policy was developed to manage and prioritize resident requests to slow vehicle traffic and/or improve perceived safety concerns in the street network. As such, these projects are fundamentally neighbourhood driven. The policy is intended to provide a data based operational framework that responds to resident input while enabling project decisions without the need for direct Council input to avoid a time consuming process and prioritize staff resources for project completion. The City addresses overall road network safety through a different process based on analysis of collision data and targeted countermeasures. This separate road safety initiative program is directed by the City’s annual collision report to address the predominant collision hot-spot locations.

Is Council’s concern that the proposed resident survey response rate threshold is set too high and would preclude streets from qualifying? If so, the threshold can be adjusted.

Final survey response rates for recent traffic calming projects have been in the range of 15-35% of the total number of households surveyed. This low response rate creates a situation where a small number of respondents may be choosing whether or not traffic calming is permanently implemented on a street. If a street with 100 homes only has a response rate of 10 completed surveys (10%) with 6 households (60% of respondents) voting in favour this would trigger permanent installation even though only 6% of households voted in favour of it. To address this, other municipalities in Canada have adopted response rate thresholds in the range of 40-50% +1 household.

A goal of this policy is to make the traffic calming process more participatory. It is therefore proposed that the City work towards a minimum response rate of at least 40% of the surveyed households over the next three years (by 2026). During this time staff will work to improve the response rate on projects through communication and expanded survey participation options (including a possible online survey option and prepaid postage). The anticipated increase in survey participation for projects coming through the new petition process will also be assessed. Streets evaluated for traffic calming over the next three years will not require a minimum response rate but will still require 60% of responses received in support of the project to proceed with permanent traffic calming implementation. Assuming a general improvement in response rate is achieved Council will be updated and the target response rate threshold of 40% will be adopted in 2026.

**Proposed Change:** Set a target minimum response rate for the public survey to be 40% of households surveyed by 2026. Require the support of at least “60% of the responding households” to implement permanent traffic calming.
If Council chooses to remove the final survey step of the proposed process, staff would also recommend revising the updated policy to remove the step of trialing temporary traffic calming measures on qualified streets as it would no longer serve any purpose. Staff would also recommend increasing the percentage of households required to sign the initial petition. It is noted that during public engagement on this policy update, more than 80% of survey participants were in support of the City keeping this step of the process. It is also noted that staff currently rely on this survey process to gather input from residents and to address their concerns. Without final input from residents, staff have no mechanism to deal with concerns from residents. Any resident concerns related to a decision on permanent implementation would have to be dealt with by Council directly as staff would have no means to remedy based on a policy with no final resident engagement survey.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications:
   City has recently increased the Traffic Calming Program budget for 2022 from $50,000 to $200,000.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders:
   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 are 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:
1. Keep the resident survey;
2. Set a target minimum response rate for the Traffic Calming public survey to be 40% of households surveyed by 2026 and require the support of at least “60% of the responding households” to implement permanent traffic calming.

Prepared by: Anna Snook, P.Eng. PTOE, Transportation System Engineer
Approved by: Amer Afridi, P.Eng. M.Sc, Manager Transportation Engineering
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Traffic Calming Policy Update (January 18, 2023).docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Jan 19, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

No Signature found

Amer Afridi - Jan 19, 2023 - 1:45 PM

Scott Winsor - Jan 19, 2023 - 2:08 PM

Jason Sinyard - Jan 19, 2023 - 2:09 PM
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

Ward: N/A

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.

**Project Selection and Scoring Criteria**
- Traffic Volume Threshold
- Non-Local Traffic Volume
- Interrelated Factors
- Target Speed
- Street Context
- New Development/Rehab Work

**Traffic Calming Process**
- Annual Priority List
- Formalize Temporary Implementations
- Public Survey Distribution
- Public Response Rate
- Re-evaluation Timeline
- Cul-de-sacs and Crescents/P-loops
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 5500 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>Scoring Factor</th>
<th>Point Criteria</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Active Transportation Facilities     | **For sidewalk**: 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  
**For bike route**: 5 points if there is an existing bike route or is part of Bike Master Plan full network | 15        | Weight increased for vulnerable road users (DN March 2021)                              |

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: Traffic Calming Policy Update (February 6, 2023)
Date Prepared: January 31, 2023
Report To: Regular Meeting of Council
Councillor and Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Transportation & Regulatory Services
Ward: N/A

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 and 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.

Project Selection and Scoring Criteria
- Traffic Volume Threshold
- Non-Local Traffic Volume
- Interrelated Factors
- Target Speed
- Street Context
- New Development/Rehab Work

Traffic Calming Process
- Annual Priority List
- Formalize Temporary Implementations
- Public Survey Distribution
- Public Response Rate
- Re-evaluation Timeline
- Cul-de-sacs and Crescents/P-loops
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. Council’s feedback and comments were incorporated into a November 2022 Decision Note that was brought to Council but was referred back to staff and Committee of the Whole after issues regarding the proposed survey process and response rate were raised. Staff brought more information and a revised January 2023 Decision Note to Committee of the Whole where Council approved the proposed approach.

The following decision note presents a summary of the finalized Traffic Calming Policy updates that reflects all of the feedback and comments raised to date.

**Key Policy Updates**

The following are the list of proposed updates to 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. While previous review recommended revising this upper volume threshold to make the scoring more sensitive to higher traffic volumes, a review of traffic volume data of the City’s local and collector streets indicated that the upper volume thresholds of 2150 vpd and 5500 vpd, respectively, are 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. By including a non-local traffic volume factor, a busy street can score 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 adding more weight 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). A jurisdictional scan indicated all other municipalities base scoring for speed on the posted speed limit. Therefore, the updated policy will maintain this approach. 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 streets 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 a scoring system 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 test and evaluate the impact for both residents/road users and the technical team and has proved to be an effective approach. 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 initial 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: Public participation is an important part of successfully implementing permanent traffic calming measures in neighborhoods. The final step in the proposed updated traffic calming process is to survey residents of the street and ask them to provide input on the temporary traffic calming measures that were installed as a trial on their street. It would be the only survey completed by the City during the process and would be distributed to all residents of the street giving everyone an opportunity to determine how the project proceeds. It would also be the only opportunity for a resident to express opposition to a project within the formal process. During public engagement on this policy update, 86% of survey participants were in favour of the City conducting and distributing this survey.

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

Final survey response rates for recent traffic calming projects have been in the range of 15-35% of the total number of households surveyed. This low response rate creates a situation where a small number of respondents may be choosing whether or not traffic calming is permanently implemented on a street. If a street with 100 homes only has a response rate of 10 completed surveys (10%) with 6 households (60% of respondents) voting in favour this would trigger permanent installation even though only 6% of households voted in favour of it. To address this, other municipalities in Canada have adopted response rate thresholds in the range of 40-50% +1 household.

A goal of this policy is to make the traffic calming process more participatory. It is therefore proposed that the City work towards a minimum response rate of at least 40% of the surveyed households over the next three years (by 2026). During this time staff will work to improve the response rate on projects through communication and expanded survey participation options (including a possible online survey option and prepaid postage). The anticipated increase in survey participation for projects coming through the new petition process will also be assessed. Streets evaluated for traffic calming over the next three years will not require a minimum response rate but will still require 60% of responses received in support of the project to proceed with permanent traffic calming implementation. Assuming a general improvement in response rate is achieved Council will be updated and the target response rate threshold of 40% will be adopted in 2026.
**Proposed Change**: Keep the final resident survey and set a target minimum response rate of 40% of households surveyed by 2026. Require the support of at least “60% of the responding households” to implement permanent traffic calming.

**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 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 to be reconsidered. It is recommended that re-evaluation timeline be changed from 2 years to 5 years to allow more time to focus on new requests and optimize staff resources (DN March 2021). If there is a major change in area traffic patterns, a street may be exempted from the evaluation timeframe.

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

**Cul-de-sacs and Crescents/P-loops**: The 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. Time and money for data collection and analysis is therefore wasted in assessing their eligibility. As such, the updated policy is streamlined by excluding these from consideration, thereby focusing on streets that are more likely to meet eligibility requirements. Some of these street types in the city are long; therefore, a 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 Work**: It was recommended to include provision for the application of traffic calming tools to projects identified under new developments and road rehabilitation (DN March 2021). This aligns with the Envision St. John’s Municipal Plan 2021 which states “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. Some examples of traffic calming measures suitable for these types of projects are roundabouts, curb extensions and raised crosswalks. New development projects do not involve public consultation on the traffic calming features; however, Staff may consult stakeholders such as Emergency Services and Metrobus, where needed.

If a street is eligible for traffic calming (scores above 30) and is also being considered for City street rehabilitation, this streets will be given high priority for temporary installation. The traffic calming process followed for this kind of project will be the same as for all other streets.

**Proposed Change:**
- Integrate traffic calming as part of new developments where appropriate.
- Streets qualified for traffic calming and considered for Rehab projects will be given high priority in the Traffic Calming process to be aligned with Rehab projects for implementation.

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

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

**Table 1** presents revised scoring scheme reflecting the 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 as described. 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: 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 clearing are not practical and cannot be added in the revised scoring scheme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Factor</th>
<th>Point Criteria</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Collision History            | 1 point for each Property Damage Only (PDO) collision in the past 3 years  

2 points for each injury/fatal collisions, or 2 points for each collision involving vulnerable road users in the past 3 years | 10        | Updated policy considers scores for PDO and injury/fatal collisions too; Max points for local and collector are same.                                                                                   |
| Traffic Volume               | **Local road**: 1 point for every 50 vehicles above 900 vpd  

**Collector road**: 1 point for every 100 vehicles above 3,000 vpd | 25        | Maximum point increased: 10 points added to Local and 5 to Collector.                                                                                                                             |
| Traffic Speed                | **Local road**: 1 point for each 1 km/h above posted speed  

**Collector road**: 1 point for each 1 km/h above threshold (i.e., posted speed + 5 km/hr) | 30        |                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Pedestrian Generators        | 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  

5 points if there is an elementary school or safe route to school within the study area, to max of 5 | 15        | More facilities added in the pedestrian generator list.                                                                                                                                           |
| Active Transportation Facilities | **For sidewalk**: 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  

**For bike route**: 5 points if there is an existing bike route or is part of Bike Master Plan full network | 15        | Weight increased for vulnerable road users (DN March 2021)                                                                                                                                          |
**Score Table for Adjacent Land Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Factor</th>
<th>Point Criteria</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Land Use</td>
<td>5 points if fully residential area; reduce 1 point for every 20% non-residential area. That means: &lt;br&gt; 5 points - All residential area &lt;br&gt; 4 points - Approx 80% residential area &lt;br&gt; 3 points - Approx 60% residential area &lt;br&gt; 2 points - Approx 40% residential area &lt;br&gt; 1 point - Approx 20% residential area &lt;br&gt; 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>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Blue text describes factors or criteria added to 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:**

   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 the proposed changes to the City’s Traffic Calming Policy presented in this Decision Note.

**Prepared by:** Anna Snook, P.Eng. PTOE, Transportation System Engineer

**Approved by:** Amer Afridi, P.Eng. M.Sc, Manager Transportation Engineering
Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Traffic Calming Policy Update (February 6, 2023).docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 1, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Amer Afridi - Jan 31, 2023 - 1:35 PM
Scott Winsor - Jan 31, 2023 - 1:43 PM
Jason Sinyard - Feb 1, 2023 - 11:39 AM
Permits List
Council's February 6, 2023, Regular Meeting
Permits Issued: 2023/01/26 to 2023/02/01

BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED

### Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129 Patrick St</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Townhousing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 Elizabeth Ave</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Balsam St</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Semi Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Balsam St</td>
<td>Deck</td>
<td>Patio Deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Larch Pl</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Monkstown Rd</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached w/ apt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Hayward Ave</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Semi Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Diamond Marsh Dr</td>
<td>Deck</td>
<td>Patio Deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Fleming St</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Perlin St</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy/Renovations</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Pepperwood Dr</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130 Kelsey Dr</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Nils Way</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Retail Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270 Water St</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy</td>
<td>Place Of Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 Water St</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy</td>
<td>Retail Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281 Duckworth St</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Airport Rd</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Torbay Rd</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7 Cashin Ave</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy</td>
<td>Commercial School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394 Kenmount Rd</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>Veterinary Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394 Kenmount Rd</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy/Renovations</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495 Water St</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655 Topsail Rd</td>
<td>Change of Occupancy/Renovations</td>
<td>Service Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Torbay Rd</td>
<td>Renovations</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Casey St</td>
<td>Deck</td>
<td>Patio Deck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Week: $1,389,800.00

This Week: $1,826,746.00
Government/Institutional

| Location | Permit Type | Structure Type | This Week: $0.00 |

Industrial

| Location | Permit Type | Structure Type | This Week: $0.00 |

Demolition

| Location | Permit Type | Structure Type | This Week: $0.00 |

This Week's Total: $3,216,546.00

REPAIR PERMITS ISSUED: $40,815.00

NO REJECTIONS

---

**YEAR TO DATE COMPARISONS**

February 6, 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>% Variance (+/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$3,187,497.10</td>
<td>$3,054,485.00</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$4,524,956.50</td>
<td>$2,863,117.50</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/Institutional</td>
<td>$301,788.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>$100,499.99</td>
<td>$40,815.00</td>
<td>-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$8,114,741.59</td>
<td>$5,958,417.50</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units (1 &amp; 2 Family Dwelling)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully Submitted,

Jason Sinyard, P.Eng., MBA
Deputy City Manager
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services
## memorandum

**Weekly Payment Vouchers**  
**For The**  
**Week Ending February 1, 2023**

### Payroll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>$578,352.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Weekly Administration</td>
<td>$779,653.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Weekly Management</td>
<td>$930,201.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Weekly Fire Department</td>
<td>$827,318.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accounts Payable**  
$7,062,609.59

*(A detailed breakdown [here]*)

**Total:**  
$10,178,135.66
Bid # and Name: Supply Clarifier Collector Equipment for the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF).

Date Prepared: Thursday, February 2, 2023

Report To: Regular Meeting

Councillor and Role: Councillor Sandy Hickman, Public Works

Ward: N/A

Department: Public Works

Division: Water & Wastewater

Quotes Obtained By: Deanne Harper

Budget Code: 4225-56160

Source of Funding: Operating

Purpose:
Supply clarifier collector equipment for the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF). The Riverhead WWTF operates three primary clarifiers for settling and removal of wastewater solids. The clarifier collectors are required to remove the solids from the clarifiers. The collectors in clarifier #2 have reached the end of their life and require replacement.

Results:
☐ As attached  ☒ As noted below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evoqua Water Technologies</td>
<td>$405,560.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Value:  ☒ As above

☐ Value shown is an estimate only for a # year period. The City does not guarantee to buy specific quantities or dollar value.

Contract Duration: Installation time is one (1) month

Bid Exception: Contract Award Without Open Call

Recommendation:
That Council approve for award this contract award without an open call for bids to the exclusive supplier, Evoqua Water Technologies, for $405,560.86 plus HST, as per Public Procurement Act.
Attachments:

Report Approval Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title:</th>
<th>Supply Clarifier Collector Equipment for the Riverhead Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF).docx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>- Contract Award Without Open Call - Clarifier Collectors 2023.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Approval Date:</td>
<td>Feb 2, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Rick Squires - Feb 2, 2023 - 11:31 AM

Derek Coffey - Feb 2, 2023 - 11:42 AM
TO: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Public Procurement Agency

Report to Chief Procurement Officer, Public Procurement Agency (Pursuant to Section 32 or The Public Procurement Regulations) Version 1 – 2018-03-24

FROM: Government Funded Body
City of St. John’s, P.O. Box 908, St. John’s, NL A1C5M2

Contract Description:

Contractor, Supplier or Lessor:

Name:

Address: Country:

Contract Price (exclusive of HST):

Contract # or PO #: Date of Award:

Relevant Exception Clause (select only one):

Reason(s) Why an Open Call for Bids Was Not Invited:

Prepared by: Date:

Head of Public Body: Date:
( DCM - Finance & Admin)
Contract Award Without an Open Call for Bids

Relevant Exemption Clauses:

6(a)(ii): The commodity is of the nature that an open call for bids could reasonably be expected to compromise security (limited call for bids required)

6(a)(iii): The commodity is available from a public body

6(a)(iv): An emergency or a situation or urgency exists and the acquisition of the commodity cannot reasonably be made in time by an open call for bids

6(a)(v): There is only one source reasonably available for the commodity

6(a)(vi): A list of pre-qualified suppliers has been established using a request for qualifications and the public body is requesting quotations from all pre-qualified suppliers on the list

6(a)(vii): An acquisition of a commodity is for the purpose of resale or for incorporation into a product or resale

6(b): Set rates have been established by the Public Utilities Boards acting under the Public Utilities Act or another Act

19: (1) The acquisition of a commodity is exempt from the requirements of the framework where the following requirements are satisfied:

   (a) the minister responsible for economic development has recommended the exemption on the basis that the acquisition of the commodity is for the purpose of economic development;

   (b) the exemption has been approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council; and

   (c) the exemption is not precluded by an intergovernmental trade agreement.

   (2) Where a public body acquires a commodity that is exempted under subsection (1), the public body shall report the acquisition to the chief procurement officer.
NOTICE OF MOTION

TAKE NOTICE that I will at the next regular meeting of the St. John’s Municipal Council move for the adoption of the Code of Conduct for Municipal Officials and the Code of Conduct for Councillors as required under the Municipal Conduct Act.

DATED at St. John’s, NL this day of February, 2023.

____________________________
COUNCILLOR
DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: CERAWEEK – 2023 – Houston, Texas

Date Prepared: February 2, 2023

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Mayor Danny Breen, Governance & Strategic Priorities

Ward: N/A

Decision/Direction Required:

Council approval is being sought for travel by Mayor Danny Breen to attend CERAWEEK, in Houston, TX from March 6-10, 2023.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

CERAWeek is the preeminent annual energy conference for through leaders, energy executives, and government officials. The conference provides a platform for discussion on a range of energy-related topics, including the world economic outlook, geopolitics, energy policy and regulation, climate change and technological innovation, hydrogen and other renewables, among other topics. With strong global demand for green energy projects, there is a window of opportunity, and the provincial strategic location to key markets presents an opportunity for investment.

The intent is that each energy city mayor, including Mayor Breen, will have at least one speaking opportunity on a panel at CERAWeek. The energy cities will be holding their working meeting during the week also. The Government of Canada will have a program that affords the opportunity for St. John’s to meet with a variety of energy related businesses and delegates for the purposes of identifying future potential business development opportunities.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Budgeted Travel

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Government of Canada and World Energy Cities

3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

   A Sustainable City: Facilitate and create the conditions that drive the economy by being business and industry friendly; and being a location of choice for residents, businesses and visitors.
An Effective City: Ensure accountability and good governance through transparent and open decision making.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: Not applicable

5. Accessibility and Inclusion: Not applicable

6. Legal or Policy Implications: Not applicable

7. Privacy Implications: Not applicable

8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Not applicable

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 travel costs associated for Mayor Danny Breen to attend the 2023 CERAWeek, Houston, TX.

**Prepared by:** Stacey Fallon, Executive Assistant

**Approved by:** Karen Chafe, City Clerk