Civic Works Committee

The 1st Meeting of the Civic Works Committee
January 19, 2021, 12:00 PM
2021 Virtual Meeting - during the COVID-19 Emergency
City Hall is temporarily closed to the public for in-person attendance at Standing Committees and Council meetings.
Meetings can be viewed via live-streaming on YouTube and the City website.

Members
Councillors E. Peloza (Chair), J. Helmer, M. Cassidy, P. Van Meerbergen, S. Turner, Mayor E. Holder

The City of London is committed to making every effort to provide alternate formats and communication supports for Council, Standing or Advisory Committee meetings and information, upon request. To make a request for any City service, please contact accessibility@london.ca or 519-661-2489 ext. 2425. To make a request specific to this meeting, please contact CWC@london.ca

1. Call to Order
   1.1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest
   1.2. Election of Vice Chair for the term ending November 30, 2021

2. Consent
   2.1. RFP 20-60 Large Diameter Watermain Inspection
   2.2. Proposed Expansion of the W12A Landfill Site - Updated Environmental Assessment Engineering Consulting Costs
   2.3. Huxley Street Closing
   2.4. Ministry of Transportation Road Closures for the Highway 401/Highway 4 (Colonel Talbot Road) Interchange Improvements
   2.5. Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive Intersection Improvements Environmental Assessment Study - Appointment of Consulting Engineer
   2.6. Appointment of Consulting Engineers - Springbank Dam Decommissioning
   2.7. Amendments to the Traffic and Parking By-law
   2.8. RFP 20-72 Supply and Delivery of Medium Duty Crew Cab Trucks

3. Scheduled Items
   3.1. Item not to be heard before 12:05 PM - Public Participation Meeting - Street Renaming Portion of Darlington Place (Plan 33M-773)

4. Items for Direction
   4.1. Implementing Speed Bumps on Aldersbrook Gate - A. Mercer
5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business

5.1. Deferred Matters List

6. Adjournment
To:   Chair and Members  
Civic Works Committee  

From:   Kelly Scherr, P.Eng., MBA, FEC  
Managing Director, Environmental & Engineering Services  
and City Engineer  

Subject: RFP 20-60 Large Diameter Watermain Inspection  

Date: January 19, 2021  

Recommendation  

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services & City Engineer, the following actions be taken with respect to the Large Diameter Watermain Inspection project:  

• The bid submitted by Kenwave Solutions Inc., 7080 Derrycrest Drive, Mississauga, Ontario, L5W 0G5, in the amount of $1,041,546.00 (excluding H.S.T.) be awarded in accordance with Section 15.2.e of the City of London’s Procurement of Goods and Services Policy.  

• The financing for this project be approved as set out in the Sources of Financing Report attached hereto as Appendix A.  

• The Civic Administration be authorized to undertake all the administrative acts that are necessary in connection with this project.  

• The Mayor and City Clerk be authorized to execute any contract or other documents, if required, to give effect to these recommendations.  

Executive Summary  

Purpose  

This report recommends that Kenwave Solutions Inc. be appointed as the consultant to undertake the large diameter watermain inspection of the Clarke Road, Commissioners Road East, Huron Street, King Street, Sunningdale Road West and Wellington Road pipelines.  

Context  

The inspection of trunk watermains is an annual program designed to secure the reliability of the City of London’s water supply and allow staff to make informed decisions regarding condition and need for repair. This information helps mitigate the risk of catastrophic watermain breaks and helps to better manage our critical watermain assets.  

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan  

This recommendation supports the following 2019-2023 Strategic Plan areas of focus:  

• Leading in Public Service:  
  o Trusted, open, and accountable in service of our community;  
  o Exceptional and valued customer service; and  
  o Leader in public service as an employer, a steward of public funds, and an innovator of service.  

• Building a Sustainable City:  
  o London’s infrastructure is built, maintained, and operated to meet the long-term needs of our community.
1.0 Background Information

1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

- Concrete Pressure Pipe Inspection Fiber Optic Installation Amendment of Existing Contract Civic Works Committee Report May 29, 2012.

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

The City of London’s trunk watermains are critical infrastructure in London’s water supply system. The trunk watermains supply water to the smaller diameter pipelines which in turn supply water to individual customers. The City’s trunk watermains are critical infrastructure that ensure adequate water supply and reliability for customers.

Inspection of the City’s trunk watermains will secure the reliability of the City of London’s water supply and allow staff to make informed decisions regarding condition and need for repair. This year’s annual inspection will identify the need to carry out maintenance on the trunk watermains which will reduce the potential for catastrophic watermain breaks in the future. The decision of which sections of pipeline are to be inspected each year is based on pipe age, pipe material, criticality, and anticipated construction projects for that section.

For this iteration inspection program, six sections of pipe were identified for inspection with a total length of approximately 21 km. The inspections are to be completed over the duration of a two-year period. The details on the pipelines being inspected are as follows:

- Clarke Road from Oxford Street East to Trafalgar Street. Pipe is 2.8 kilometres of 600-millimetre steel installed in 1967 & 1968.
- Commissioners Road East from 200 metres west of Deveron Crescent to 1 kilometre east of Jackson Road. Pipe is 3.6 kilometres of 600-millimetre concrete and 75 metres of 600-millimetre steel installed in 1977.
- Huron Street from Adelaide Street North to Clarke Road. Pipe is 5.0 kilometres of 600-millimetre steel installed in 1955 and 1956.
- King Street from Maitland Street to Egerton Street. Pipe is 1.7 kilometres of 600-millimetre concrete installed in 1966.
- Sunningdale Rd West from 600 metres east of Richmond Street to Hyde Park Road and Hyde Park Road from Sunningdale Road West to Fanshawe Park Road West. Pipe is 4 kilometres of 900-millimetre concrete installed in 1996 and 3 kilometres of 900-millimetre steel installed in 1990 and 1995.
- Wellington Road from Commissioners Road East to Southdale Road East. Pipe is 1.7 kilometres of 600-millimetre concrete installed in 1960.

3.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

The inspections assignments were awarded on an individual basis and the three Proponents submitted separate technical and cost proposals for each of the six inspections. These watermains were assessed by the Water Engineering Department before the request for proposal was issued and it was determined that the different technologies offered by each of the respective Proponents would be able to provide the desired level of inspection. This decision was based on the relative age of the watermains and the locations of these watermains. In November of 2020, three engineering firms responded to the open request for proposal in accordance with section 15.2 (e) of the City of London’s Procurement of Goods and Services Policy.
After evaluation of the request for proposal submissions, the City’s evaluation team determined that Kenwave Solutions Inc. provided the best value and their technology presented the least amount of operational risk for all six inspections. The technical proposals and fee submissions were evaluated in accordance with the City of London’s Procurement of Goods and Services Policy and it was found that the proposals met all of the key project requirements and provided the best value to the City for inspection services.

**Conclusion**

Kenwave Solutions Inc. has experience undertaking similar work of this caliber while providing useful and actionable information for large diameter watermain repairs. Although they have not completed work for the City of London in the past, their team has extensive experience with similar work and is well qualified to undertake the required inspections.

Based on the results of the request for proposal submissions and based on the review by the evaluation team, it is determined that retaining Kenwave Solutions Inc. is in the best financial and technical interests of the City. It is recommended that Kenwave Solutions Inc. be awarded this contract in the amount of $1,041,546.00 (excluding H.S.T.) to undertake all tasks related to the six large diameter watermain inspections.

**Prepared by:** Aaron Rozentals, GDPA, P.Eng., Division Manager, Water Engineering

**Submitted by:** Scott Mathers, MPA, P. Eng., Director, Water And Wastewater

**Recommended by:** Kelly Scherr, P. Eng., MBA, FEC Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer

**CC:** Stephen Romano, J. Simon, Elia Rizkalla (KenWave Solutions Inc.)
#21006
January 19, 2021
(Appoint Consulting Engineer)

Chair and Members
Civic Works Committee

RE: RFP 20-60 Large Diameter Watermain Inspection
(Subledger NT21EW01)
Capital Project EW371718 - Inspect Trunk Concrete Pressure Pipes
Kenwave Solutions Inc. - $1,041,546.00 (excluding HST)

Finance and Corporate Services Report on the Sources of Financing:
Finance and Corporate Services confirms that the cost of this project can be accommodated within the financing available for it in the Capital Budget, and that, subject to the approval of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the detailed source of financing for this project is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Expenditures</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Committed To This Submission</th>
<th>Balance for Future Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1,206,045</td>
<td>146,168</td>
<td>1,059,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2,018,955</td>
<td>1,694,138</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Related Expenses</td>
<td>40,059</td>
<td>38,288</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,265,059</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,878,594</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,059,877</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Financing**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Water Rates</td>
<td>2,980,353</td>
<td>1,878,594</td>
<td>1,059,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Capital Water Reserve Fund</td>
<td>284,706</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Financing</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,265,059</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,878,594</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,059,877</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Note:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Price</td>
<td>$1,041,546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: HST @13%</td>
<td>135,401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contract Price Including Taxes</strong></td>
<td>1,176,947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: HST Rebate</td>
<td>-117,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Contract Price</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,059,877</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

______________________________
Jason Davies
Manager of Financial Planning & Policy
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Report to Civic Works Committee

To: Chair and Members
   Civic Works Committee

From: Kelly Scherr, P.Eng., MBA, FEC
       Managing Director, Environmental & Engineering Services
       and City Engineer

Subject: Proposed Expansion of the W12A Landfill Site – Updated Environmental Assessment Engineering Consulting Costs

Date: January 19, 2021

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services & City Engineer, the following actions BE TAKEN with respect to the appointment of Oakridge Environmental for continued project coordination of the Individual Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Expansion of the W12A Landfill and advice/ assistance on the Environmental Protection Act (EPA), Ontario Water Resource Act (OWRA) and Planning approvals for the expansion of the W12A Landfill:

a) Oakridge Environmental BE APPOINTED to carry out additional project coordination services as part of the Individual Environmental Assessment (EA) process for the proposed expansion of the W12A Landfill and provide advice/ assistance on the Environmental Protection Act (EPA), Ontario Water Resource Act (OWRA) and Planning approvals for the expansion of the W12A Landfill, in the total amount of $61,000 excluding HST, in accordance with Section 15.2 (g) of the City of London’s Procurement of Goods and Services Policy;

b) the financing for the work identified in (a), above, BE APPROVED in accordance with the “Sources of Financing Report” attached hereto as Appendix “A”;

c) Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all the administrative acts that are necessary in connection with these purchases; and

d) the Mayor and City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute any contract or other documents, if required, to give effect to these recommendations.

Executive Summary

This report seeks approval from Committee and Council to retain Oakridge Environmental (Wesley Abbott, P.Eng.) to provide continued project coordination of the Individual Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Expansion of the W12A Landfill and advice/ assistance on the Environmental Protection Act (EPA), Ontario Water Resource Act (OWRA) and Planning approvals for the expansion of the W12A Landfill.

The value of this assignment is less than $100,000 but in combination with other assignments will exceed $100,000 and requires Council approval as per purchasing policy 15.2 g).

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

Building a Sustainable City
London’s infrastructure is built, maintained, and operated to meet long-term needs of our community
• Manage assets to prevent future infrastructure gaps

Growing our Economy
London is a leader in Ontario for attracting new jobs and investments
• Build infrastructure to support future development and retain existing jobs
Leading in Public Service
Londoners experience exceptional and valued customer service

- Increase responsiveness to our customers
- Increase efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

In 2015, Council directed staff to develop a long term residual waste disposal plan. Part of the plan includes an Individual Environmental Assessment (EA) for the expansion of the W12A Landfill. The W12A Landfill is expected to reach capacity in 2024.

There are different classes (types) of EAs depending on the type and complexity of the undertaking (project). The most rigorous EA is an Individual EA. An individual EA is less prescribed than the more common class EAs and the level of work is not finalized until the Terms of Reference (ToR) is approved by the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP). The ToR becomes the framework (work plan) for completing the EA. The ToR was approved on July 30, 2019.

Work on the Environmental Assessment began in August 2019 with refining landfill expansion alternatives (referred to “alternative methods”) and then preliminary selection of the preferred landfill expansion alternative. This was followed by more detailed impact assessments of the proposed preferred alternative which are ongoing.

The proposed preferred landfill expansion alternative is a vertical expansion over the existing waste footprint which has many advantages over other expansion alternatives. This alternative does have the greatest visual impact and a more complex engineering design.

1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

Relevant reports that can be found at [www.london.ca](http://www.london.ca) under City Hall (Meetings – Council and Standing Committees) include:

- Proposed Expansion of the W12A Landfill Site: Updated Environmental Assessment Engineering Consulting Costs (September 22, 2020 meeting of the Civic Works Committee (CWC), Item #2.12)
- Proposed Expansion of the W12A Landfill Site: Updated Environmental Assessment Engineering Consulting Costs (October 22, 2019 meeting of the CWC, Item #2.12)
- Appointment of Consulting Engineer for Various Technical Studies as part of the Environmental Assessment Process for the Proposed Expansion of the W12A Landfill Site (July 17, 2017 meeting of the CWC, Item #6)
- Appointment of Consulting Engineer Long Term Solid Waste Resource Recovery and Disposal Plans (May 24, 2016 meeting of the CWC, Item #10)

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

Oakridge Environmental (Wesley Abbott, P.Eng.) is the lead professional service resource responsible for coordinating the EA for the Expansion of the W12A Landfill. This large and complex project has reached the stage where all technical studies are complete and the draft Environmental Study Report is being prepared for Committee and Council review and approval prior to formal submission to the MECP for review. This will be the subject of a future report to the Civic Works Committee. At this stage the EA for the Expansion of the W12A Landfill is approximately two thirds complete.
In addition to Environmental Assessment Act approval, the Expansion of the W12A Landfill will require detailed engineering design and operating approvals regulated under the EPA and OWRA. There will also be land use approvals (e.g., zoning changes, etc.) that will be required. The documentation, engineering and studies required for these approvals are being completed in parallel with the EA. This is required so the expanded site (subject to approval by the Minister of Environment Conservation and Parks) will be ready to accept waste for disposal once the currently approved waste disposal capacity is consumed.

The proposal submitted by Oakridge Environmental for additional professional service fees will address the remaining work required to be coordinated in the EA for the Expansion of the W12A Landfill. It also provides for the assistance required in preliminary planning and coordinating of the work to be conducted in parallel to obtain the required EPA, OWRA and land use planning approvals.

3.0 Financial Impact

3.1 Budget

The budget for long term waste management planning, Capital Account SW6051, is summarized in Tables 1 and 2. The amount spent on the EA and the committed expenditures to date is $1,726,000 or approximately 72% of the total EA budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budget (a)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Breakdown</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA for Long Term Residual Waste Disposal (Landfill Expansion)</td>
<td>$2,398,000</td>
<td>All costs associated with the EA approval of the expansion of the W12A Landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Recovery Initiatives &amp; Strategy</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
<td>Preliminary planning and/or pilot projects for the development of resource recovery area east of the W12A Landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,808,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budget (a)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA - Spent to date</td>
<td>$1,519,000</td>
<td>Cost to develop and obtain approval of ToR and undertake the technical studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA - Committed (consulting)</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td>Primarily consulting fees for remaining EA technical studies and preparation of the EA documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA – New Consulting Fees</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
<td>This submission (excluding HST).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA - Expected Future Assignments (future costs)</td>
<td>$509,000</td>
<td>Primarily consulting fees, additional technical work, project management, community engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA - Contingency Available</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>Funds available to cover future additional costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Recovery Initiatives &amp; Strategy</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
<td>Preliminary planning and/or pilot projects for the development of resource recovery area east of W12A Landfill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(a) Rounded to the nearest $1,000.
(b) Between 2018 and 2020, approximately $95,000 from the operating budget was assigned to research at Western University through the Industrial Research Chair and the London Waste to Resources Innovation Centre.
Conclusion

The additional professional service fees of $61,000 will address the remaining work required related to the completion of the EA for the Expansion of the W12A Landfill Site. It also provides for the assistance required to complete the parallel work to secure the EPA, OWRA and land use planning approves required in order to be able to accept waste at the site in 2024.

Prepared by:    Mike Losee, B.SC
                Division Manager, Solid Waste Management

Submitted by:   Jay Stanford, MA, MPA
                Director, Environment, Fleet & Solid Waste

Recommended by: Kelly Scherr, P. Eng., MBA, FEC
                Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer

Appendix A – Source of Financing
Finance and Corporate Services Report on the Sources of Financing:
Finance and Corporate Services confirms that the cost of this project can be accommodated within the financing available for it in the Capital Budget, and that, subject to the approval of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the detailed source of financing for this project is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Expenditures</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Committed To This Date</th>
<th>Committed To This Submission</th>
<th>Balance for Future Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2,537,897</td>
<td>1,586,875</td>
<td>62,074</td>
<td>888,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Related Expenses</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>69,212</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>69,741</td>
<td>69,741</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,807,638</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,725,828</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,074</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,019,736</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Financing

| Drawdown from Sanitary Landfill Reserve Fund | 2,807,638 | 1,725,828 | 62,074 | 1,019,736 |

Total Financing

| **$2,807,638** | **$1,725,828** | **$62,074** | **$1,019,736** |

Financial Note:

| Contract Price | $61,000 |
| Add: HST @13%  | 7,930   |
| Total Contract Price Including Taxes | 68,930 |
| Less: HST Rebate | -6,856 |
| Net Contract Price | $62,074 |

__________________________________________
Jason Davies
Manager of Financial Planning & Policy

Ip
Report to Civic Works Committee

To: Chair and Members
Civic Works Committee

From: Kelly Scherr, P.Eng., MBA, FEC, Managing Director,
Environmental & Engineering Services and City Engineer

Subject: Huxley Street Closing
Date: January 19, 2021

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental & Engineering Services and City Engineer the attached proposed by-law (Appendix ‘A’) for the purpose of closing part of Huxley Street designated as Part 2 on Plan 33R-20888 BE INTRODUCED at the February 2, 2021 Council Meeting, it being noted that subject to the passing and registration of the attached closing by-law in the Land Registry Office, utility easements shall be conveyed to Enbridge Gas, Bell Canada, Rogers Communications and London Hydro and the City will retain a municipal services easement and an easement for public walkway over the lands to be conveyed.

Executive Summary

This report recommends the registration of a by-law permanently closing the northerly portion of the untravelled Huxley Street road allowance prior to it being sold to the abutting owners in accordance with a Council Resolution dated April 17, 2000. Despite the passage of time the resolution is still binding. Since the intent of the resolution can be fully complied with to the satisfaction of all parties involved, Civic Administration supports the closing request.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

Municipal Council’s 2019-2023 Strategic Plan identifies “Building a Sustainable City” and “Growing our Economy” as strategic areas of focus. The recommendation in this report will support development while maintaining an active transportation mobility connection.

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

- Environment and Transportation Committee report April 10, 2000

1.2 Binding Resolution

Further to the above noted report submitted to the Environment and Transportation Committee, the following resolution was approved by Municipal Council at their meeting held on April 17, 2000:

2. That, on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Environmental Services & City Engineer, the following actions be taken with respect to the closing of part of Huxley Street:

  a) the closing of the portion of Huxley Street adjacent to 101 and 107 Base Line Road West BE APPROVED;

  b) the closed portion of the street BE SOLD to the abutting owners for an amount to be determined by the Board of Control on the recommendation of the Commissioner or Legal Services & City Solicitor; and
c) Alan R. Patton, the solicitor for the applicants Mr. R. Saad and Ms. L. Kozman BE APPOINTED as the City’s Solicitor for the purpose of obtaining the necessary Court Order on the following terms and conditions:

i. all costs associated with the closing, including conveyancing, being borne by the applicants;

ii. the applicants agreeing that the conveyance of the closed street will be subject to the retention by the City of a 10 foot strip for a walkway to connect the southerly portion of Huxley Street to Base Line Road West;

iii. the applicants agreeing that the conveyance of the closed street will be subject to easements for existing sewers and watermain, for Bell Canada and Union Gas services and, depending on the results of the required survey, for London Hydro; and

iv. the applicants and their solicitor agreeing that the application to the Court for closing shall be made in accordance with the City Street and Lane Closing Procedure. (67.3.3) (2/8/ETC)

Notwithstanding that the resolution was not previously acted upon, it remains in effect and is binding as written.

With the exception of the existing pedestrian walkway that connects the southerly travelled portion of Huxley Street to Base Line Road West, the road allowance is not travelled by motorized vehicle, nor is it required as a road connection since there are alternative road links close by.

1.3 Location Map
2.0 Discussion

Bluestone Properties recently advised the City that they are planning to acquire the properties known municipally as 101 and 107 Base Line Road West for a proposed development. In order to support their development plans, Bluestone requires the Huxley Street road allowance that is situated between the two properties.

Bluestone have advised the City of their intention to exercise their right to acquire the road allowance as per the terms of the April 17, 2000 council resolution subject to first acquiring title to the abutting properties. In accordance with the said resolution, the City is moving forward with the first step in the process which is to permanently close the Huxley road allowance as public highway as originally intended.

Due to the passage of time and other considerations some changes will be required:

- The City’s current Street and Lane Closing procedure no longer supports highway closings by Court Order, but rather by municipal by-law. Hence the purpose of this report, which is for Council to approve the attached closing by-law in Appendix ‘A’.

- The fact that the property owners have changed from when the resolution was originally passed does not invalidate the resolution. The intent was to convey the road allowance to the abutting owners, which will be satisfied.

- In addition to the utility easements identified in the original resolution, Rogers Communications has also requested easement rights to the closed road allowance. This change is inconsequential to the intent of the resolution.

- In lieu of the City retaining a ten foot (3 metre) wide strip of land for the existing walkway, the entire road allowance will be conveyed but an easement for public usage will be retained. This will ensure the walkway will be protected, but also provide an option to relocate the walkway to a more advantageous location through the site plan approval process subject to the approval of Transportation Planning and Design.

None of these changes substantially change the intent of the original resolution and the Legal Department has advised that the City can proceed to close and convey the road allowance based on these amended terms and remain in compliance with the original resolution.

The closing and sale will not affect the public since the walkway will be protected, though its location may be modified through the site plan review process. Civic Administration including the Legal Department, Transportation Planning and Design and Development Services are fully supportive of the closing and sale and of the road allowance which will ultimately lead to more efficient land use.

Once the Huxley road allowance has been legally closed by By-law, the conveyance of the land to Bluestone based on fair market value will be the subject of a report by Realty Services to the Corporate Services Committee.

3.0 Financial Impact

There are no significant cost implications to the City to close the road allowance by By-law. Bluestone is responsible for all costs including providing the required reference plan, their legal fees and for cost to purchase the lands as recommended by Realty Services.
Conclusion

The original April 17, 2000 resolution to close and sell the Huxley Street road allowance was not previously acted upon. However, the resolution is binding and can still be complied with. Therefore it is recommended the attached closing By-law be approved in accordance with the resolution's intent. The road allowance is not required for public transportation purposes other than the pedestrian walkway which will be retained. The actual conveyance of the road allowance will be the subject of a future report put forward by Realty Services to the Corporate Services Committee.

Prepared by: A. Gary Irwin, OLS, OLIP, Manager of Geomatics and City Surveyor
Submitted by: Doug MacRae, P. Eng., MPA, Director, Roads and Transportation
Recommended by: Kelly Scherr, P. Eng., MBA, FEC, Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer
Attachment: Appendix A, Proposed Closing Bylaw
C: M. Pease, Development and Compliance Services
     B. Warner, Realty Services
Appendix A

Bill No. ___
2021

By-law No. S.-__________________

A by-law to stop up and close Huxley Street south of Base Line Road West

WHEREAS it is expedient to stop up and close Huxley Street south of Base Line Road West in the City of London;

NOW THEREFORE the Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

1. Huxley Street shall be stopped up and forever closed and cease to be and form public highway:

   Part of Huxley Street (formerly John Street) on Registered Plan 193(C) designated as Part 2 on Plan 33R-20888 in the City of London and County of Middlesex.

2. The lands comprising the said street hereby stopped up and closed shall continue to be vested in the Corporation of the City of London to be dealt with from time to time as the Council of the Corporation of the City of London may see fit and deem proper.

PASSED in Open Council on ______________.

Ed Holder
Mayor

Catharine Saunders
City Clerk

First Reading –
Second Reading –
Third Reading –
Report to Civic Works Committee

To: Chair and Members
Civic Works Committee

From: Kelly Scherr, P.Eng., MBA, FEC, Managing Director,
Environmental & Engineering Services and City Engineer

Subject: Ministry of Transportation Road Closures for the Highway
401/Highway 4 (Colonel Talbot Road) Interchange
Improvements

Date: January 19, 2021

Recommendation

That on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental & Engineering Services and City Engineer, the required municipal road closures related to the Highway 401 / Highway 4 (Colonel Talbot Road) interchange improvements and the Highway 4 and Glanworth Drive underpass bridge replacements BE ENDORSED in accordance with the approved Transportation Environmental Study Report prepared by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO).

Executive Summary

This report provides information on the planned Highway 401 / Highway 4 (Colonel Talbot Road) interchange improvements including the Glanworth Drive underpass replacement being managed by the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) and seeks endorsement of the required municipal road closures in the vicinity of the interchange to facilitate the improvements. MTO has undertaken an environmental assessment for the project which was approved August 31, 2020.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan
The following report supports the Strategic Plan through the strategic focus area of Building a Sustainable City and ensuring London’s infrastructure is built, maintained and operated to meet the long term needs of our community.

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

- Environment and Transportation Committee – January 12, 2004 – Highway 401 Improvements: Planning Study Completion;
- Civic Works Committee – February 4, 2013 – Agreement with Ministry of Transportation; and,
- Civic Works Committee – March 19, 2018 – Endorsement of Environmental Assessment.

2.0 Context

MTO has undertaken an environmental assessment and created a Transportation Environmental Study Report (TESR) for improvements at the interchange of Highway 401 and Highway 4 (Colonel Talbot Road) including the Glanworth Drive underpass bridge. The TESR was initiated late in 2012 and included extensive consultation with the public including the residents in the area. The study was finalized and issued for public review on October 29, 2018 which closed on December 10, 2018. A Part II order request was encountered by the project. The Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) approved the project on August 31, 2020.
MTO is now completing the preliminary design and moving into the detailed design phase. MTO will be retaining a design build team for the next phase in 2021.

Attached as Appendix A is an exhibit from MTO’s planned submission to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT). The figure illustrates the approved layout for the interchange including revisions to road alignments in the area. The municipal roadways with changes to alignment include:

- Glanworth Drive;
- Littlewood Drive;
- Tempo Road; and,
- Burtwhistle Lane.

Also noted in Appendix A are the related six road closures as they impact the Provincial Controlled Access Highway (CAH) limit of MTO lands in the vicinity of the interchange. MTO will be applying to the LPAT for the approval of the closing of any road which comes under the provisions of Section 37(2) of the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act. Prior to the submission to LPAT, MTO is looking for the City’s endorsement of the road closings.

3.0 Discussion and Considerations

The overall approval of the interchange improvements will include realignment of Glanworth Drive, Littlewood Drive, Tempo Road and Burtwhistle Lane as noted in Appendix A. As a result, MTO will require road closures of the original roadway alignments as noted.

The proposed road closures and associated roadway realignments will not result in any significant access issues for the residents and businesses located along these roadways. Local access issues have been addressed as part of the TESR.

Environmental & Engineering Services staff have reviewed the proposed road closures and support the closures as they will improve safety and operation of the interchange.

MTO will be responsible for acquiring all of the property, building the new realigned roads and associated infrastructure and for dedicating and transferring the completed road allowances to the City. The transfer to the City will be done through Order in Council (OIC), which will require a future report to municipal council for approval of the transfer by bylaw.

Conclusion

The approved reconfiguration of this interchange was informed by public consultation. The new design involves realignment of several roads to improve operations and safety. The procedure to realign the local roads involves a formal closing followed by the dedication of new road allowances when the property is available. An endorsement of the required road closures by MTO is recommended.

Prepared by: Garfield Dales, P.Eng., Division Manager, Transportation Planning and Design
Submitted by: Doug MacRae, P.Eng., MPA, Director, Roads and Transportation
Recommended by: Kelly Scherr, P.Eng., MBA, FEC, Managing Director and City Engineer
Attach: Appendix A: Exhibit “B” – LPAT Road Closings for LPAT Submission – GWP 3030-11-00
cc: Gary Irwin
    Karl Grabowski
    Geddes Mahabir – MTO
    Natalia Bartos – MTO

Appendix A: Exhibit “B” – LPAT Road Closings for LPAT Submission
Report to Civic Works Committee

To: Chair and Members
Civic Works Committee

From: Kelly Scherr, P.Eng., MBA, FEC, Managing Director,
Environmental & Engineering Services and City Engineer

Subject: Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive Intersection
Improvements Environmental Assessment Study
Appointment of Consulting Engineer

Date: January 19, 2021

Recommendation

That on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental & Engineering Services and City Engineer the following actions BE TAKEN with respect to the appointment of a Consulting Engineer for the Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive Intersection Improvements Environmental Assessment Study:

(a) R.V. Anderson Associates Limited BE APPOINTED as a Consulting Engineer to complete the Schedule ‘B’ Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for the Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive Intersection Improvements at an upset amount of $174,471 (excluding HST) in accordance with RFP20-56 and Section 15.2 (e) of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy;

(b) the financing for this assignment BE APPROVED as set out in the Sources of Financing Report attached hereto as Appendix A;

(c) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all the administrative acts that are necessary in connection with this assignment;

(d) the approvals given herein BE CONDITIONAL upon the Corporation entering into a formal contract with the consultant for the work; and,

(e) the Mayor and City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute any contract or other documents including agreements, if required, to give effect to these recommendations.

Executive Summary

This report recommends the appointment of a consulting engineer to complete the environmental assessment (EA) for the Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive intersection improvements. The purpose of this EA is to satisfy the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act by undertaking a comprehensive, environmentally sound planning process with public participation. The process will also facilitate dialogue between parties with number of different interests and consider other planned future transportation improvements in the area.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

The following report supports the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan through the focus area of Building a Sustainable City by building new transportation infrastructure to meet the long term needs of our community.
Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

- Civic Works Committee – June 19, 2012 – London 2030 Transportation Master Plan
- Civic Works Committee – September 7, 2016 – London ON Bikes Cycling Master Plan
- Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee – May 6, 2019 – Approval of 2019 Development Charges By-Law and DC Background Study

2.0 Context

This EA is required to implement transportation infrastructure improvements for the Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive intersection. The need for the intersection improvement was identified as part of the recent update of the City of London’s Development Charges Background Study and in the Transportation Impact Assessment conducted for the Eagle Ridge subdivision. It is recommended to implement the improvements for the Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive intersection in 2024. The EA is being initiated now to accommodate project timelines including identification of property needs and utility relocations.

The EA will identify the needs and balance the requirements of the full range of potential users within the community including users of all ages and abilities, pedestrians, cyclists, transit vehicles and motorists. The EA will also consider the impacts associated with climate change in the context of the proposed improvements.

3.0 Discussion and Considerations

3.1 Project Description

The study area for this EA will include the Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive intersection and surrounding area as shown on the Figure 1 below. The Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive intersection was previously a three-leg stop controlled intersection with a long high speed right-turn ramp located on the west side of the city. Kains Road, and a multi-use path is a new fourth leg for this intersection that is being constructed as part of the Eagle Ridge Phase 2 residential development north of the intersection. Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive are classified as Urban and Rural Thoroughfares respectively. Gideon Drive carries approximately 2,500 vehicles per day and Oxford Street West carries approximately 18,500 and 15,500 vehicles per day east and west of the intersection respectively.
This EA will explore various intersection improvement design alternatives and develop a functional plan for the preferred design. The alternatives will be evaluated using a range of criteria including impacts on the natural, social, cultural, and economic environments and will be informed by consultation. Signalized and roundabout alternatives will be considered and will have regard for the evolving needs due to development, unique geometry and location of the intersection.

The EA study will also:

- Recommend the improvements for the Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive intersection that will address deficiencies, accommodate increased traffic demand, improve safety, and provide the best value for the City;
- Develop a functional design concept that considers urban design and aesthetics;
- Engage the public and stakeholders to allow public input and active involvement throughout the study process;
- Determine the right-of-way and property requirements;
- Coordinate underground service needs;
- Coordinate with other ongoing EAs, projects, studies; and,
- Assess and document the ecological and natural features within the corridor and identify any mitigation measures.

Document in a clear and transparent manner the process undertaken and provide formal documentation and presentations.

3.2 Consultant Procurement Process

The consultant selection process for this EA Study (RFP 20-56) has been undertaken in accordance with the City’s Procurement of Goods and Services Policy. The procurement process followed the two stage process with the first stage being an open, publicly advertised pre-qualification stage (RFQUAL). Subsequently, a consultant shortlist comprising of three engineering consulting firms was developed and these consultants were invited to submit detailed proposals and work plans. Proposals were received from two consultants, R.V. Anderson and Wood Canada Ltd on October 20, 2020. The selection committee evaluated the proposals against an established evaluation criteria which included an understanding of project objectives, team
The evaluation committee determined that the submission from R.V. Anderson Associates Limited provides the best value for the City. R.V. Anderson Associates Limited has experienced project team members with the required qualifications. Their proven experience on similar projects combined with a project proposal that demonstrated a thorough understanding of the project goals and objectives determined their suitability for this assignment. The consultant will be considered for future project phases subject to performance.

**Conclusion**

The R.V. Anderson Associates Limited proposal has demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the requirements for this project. Based on the competitive consultant procurement process, it is recommended that R.V. Anderson Associates Limited be appointed to undertake the environmental assessment study for the Oxford Street West and Gideon Drive intersection improvements in the amount of $174,471.00 (excluding HST).

There are no anticipated additional annual operating costs to the Environmental and Engineering Services Department budget associated with this consulting assignment.

---

**Prepared by:** Garfield Dales, P.Eng., Division Manager, Transportation Planning and Design

**Submitted by:** Doug MacRae, P.Eng., MPA, Director, Roads and Transportation

**Recommended by:** Kelly Scherr, P.Eng., MBA, FEC, Managing Director Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer

**Attach:** Appendix A: Source of Financing

**cc:** John Freeman, Manager, Purchasing and Supply
John Stevely, Procurement Officer, Purchasing and Supply
Gary McDonald, Budget Analyst
R.V. Anderson Associates Limited


#21001

January 19, 2021
(Appoint Consulting Engineers)

Chair and Members
Civic Works Committee

RE: Appointment of Consulting Engineer - Oxford Street West & Gideon Drive Intersection Improvements
(Subtitle: RD200016)
Capital Project TS1332 - Intersection - Oxford/Gideon (Roundabout)
R.V. Anderson Associates Limited - $174,471.00 (excluding H.S.T.)

Finance & Corporate Services Report on the Sources of Financing:
Finance & Corporate Services confirms that the cost of this project can be accommodated within the financing available for it in the Capital Budget and that, subject to the recommendations of the Managing Director of Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the detailed source of financing for this project is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Expenditures</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>This Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$177,541</td>
<td>$177,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$177,541</td>
<td>$177,541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Financing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debenture Quota (note 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22,193</td>
<td>$22,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from City Services - Roads Reserve Fund (Development Charges) (note 2 and 3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155,348</td>
<td>155,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FINANCING</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$177,541</td>
<td>$177,541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Note:
- Contract Price $174,471
- Add: HST @13% 22,681
- Total Contract Price Including Taxes 197,152
- Less: HST Rebate -19,611
- Net Contract Price $177,541

Note 1: The required funding for Capital Project TS1332 - Intersection - Oxford/Gideon (Roundabout) is included in the 2022 approved budget. A portion of this budget ($177,541) is required in 2021 and can be accommodated by advancing a portion of the 2022 budget. Upon Council approval of this recommendation, the 2022 approved budget for project TS1332 will be revised accordingly.

Note 2: Development charges have been utilized in accordance with the underlying legislation and the approved 2021 Development Charges Background Study Update.

Note 3: Note to City Clerk: Administration hereby certifies that the estimated amounts payable in respect of this project does not exceed the annual financial debt and obligation limit for the Municipality from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs in accordance with the provisions of Ontario Regulation 403/02 made under the Municipal Act, and accordingly the City Clerk is hereby requested to prepare and introduce the necessary by-laws.

An authorizing by-law should be drafted to secure debenture financing for project TS1332 - Intersection - Oxford/Gideon (Roundabout) for the net amount to be debentured of $22,193.

---

Kyle Murray
Director, Financial Planning & Business Support
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Report to Civic Works Committee

To: Chair and Members
Civic Works Committee

From: Kelly Scherr, P.Eng., MBA, FEC
Managing Director, Environmental & Engineering Services and City Engineer

Subject: Appointment of Consulting Engineers – Springbank Dam Decommissioning

Date: January 19, 2021

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental & Engineering Services and City Engineer, the following actions BE TAKEN with respect to the Appointment of Consulting Engineers for the Springbank Dam Decommissioning:

(a) Stantec Consulting Ltd BE APPOINTED Consulting Engineers to complete the pre-design and detailed design of the 2021 Springbank Dam Decommissioning as per the recommendations outlined in the One River Environmental Assessment, in the total amount of $328,318.28, including contingency, excluding HST;

(b) the financing for this project BE APPROVED as set out in the Sources of Financing Report attached, hereto, as Appendix ‘A’.

(c) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all the administrative acts that are necessary in connection with this work;

(d) the approvals given, herein, BE CONDITIONAL upon the Corporation entering into a formal contract with the consultant for the project; and,

(e) the Mayor and the City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute any contract or other documents, if required, to give effect to these recommendations.

Executive Summary

Purpose

This report recommends the authorization of Stantec Consulting Ltd to carry out detailed design and contract administration for the Springbank Dam Decommissioning which is funded by the $3.4 million available in ES3068, which includes receipt of the final legal settlement from 2015.

Context

Springbank Dam was rendered inoperable in 2008 after newly installed steel gates failed during testing. The subsequent legal settlement was received in 2015. In 2017 the One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment considered the future use of the recreational dam. It was determined that decommissioning was the preferred option. The engineering consulting work recommended within this report will complete the detailed design for the decommissioning and partial removal of the dam.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

Municipal Council’s 2019-2023 Strategic Plan identifies “Building a Sustainable City” as a strategic area of focus. The recommendation in this report will support the protection and enhancement of the environment and the Thames River.
Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

Civic Works Committee – February 2, 2016 – Springbank Dam

Civic Works Committee – March 8, 2016 – One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment

Municipal Council – March 22, 2016 – One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment: Background Information

Civic Works Committee – November 1, 2016 – One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment: Terms of Reference

Civic Works Committee – February 21, 2017 – One River Environmental Assessment – Appointment of Consultant

Civic Works Committee – August 29, 2017 – One River Environmental Assessment Update: Technical Memorandum Stage One Work Plan and Community Consultation Plan

Civic Works Committee – September 26, 2017 – One River Environmental Assessment Update: Agency Advisory Committee Report

Civic Works Committee – January 9, 2018 – One River Environmental Assessment Update: Phase II Stage I Report

Civic Works Committee – March 19, 2018 – One River Environmental Assessment Update: Technical Memorandum Stage Two Work Plan

Civic Works Committee – May 14, 2019 – One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment: Notice of Completion

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

2.1 Work Description

This report recommends the appointment of Stantec Consulting Ltd as the Engineering Consultant for the Decommissioning of the Springbank Dam. The project includes study and design that will span over 2021 to 2022. Funds in the amount of $3.4 million have been identified in the ES3068 account as the result of the final 2015 legal settlement.

During the Civic Works Committee on May 14, 2019, the preferred Alternative 2 for the Springbank Dam was accepted in accordance with the Schedule B Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process requirements. Partial removal was the preferred alternative for the decommissioning of Springbank Dam. Partial removal includes removing components such as hydraulics, electronics, and the steel gates that currently sit on the bed of the river. The detailed design will include maintenance of the concrete structure, removal of hydraulic equipment, gates, and control room. Improvements to address dam structural stability, an ongoing preventative maintenance and safety inspection program, shoreline remediation, and habitat improvement are also included.

2.2 Procurement Process

A two-staged procurement process was used to select the recommended consultant. This is in accordance with Section 15.2(e) of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy.
The first stage was an open, publicly advertised Request for Qualifications (RFQ). The City received four submissions, which were evaluated by EESD and resulted in a short-list of three engineering consulting firms.

The second state was a competitive Request for Proposal exercise. Consultants from the short-list were invited to submit a formal proposal to undertake the design portion of the decommissioning of Springbank Dam. The evaluation of the proposals included both a technical and a cost component. The consultant was selected based on their knowledge and understanding of project goals, their experience on directly related projects and their project team members, capacity, and qualifications.

3.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

3.1 Funding from 2015 Final Legal Settlement

Following completion of the Schedule B EA, the decommissioning of Springbank Dam can now move into detailed design. There is currently $3.4 million available in ES3068 which includes receipt of the final legal settlement from 2015.

Staff have reviewed the fee submissions in detail considering the hourly rates provided by each staff member. Staff have confirmed that hourly rates are consistent with those submitted through competitive processes. Staff also reviewed the time allocated to each project related task. Staff can confirm that the amount of time allocated to each project task is consistent with prior projects of a similar nature.

The construction administration fees will be requested in a future report. The design fee of $328,318.28 includes 20% contingency and does not include HST.

4.0 Key Issues and Considerations

4.1 Key Issues Addressed

This project will address public safety around the dam structure, improve the natural environment in the vicinity of the dam, and fulfill the recommendations of the environmental assessment to decommission Springbank Dam.

Conclusion

Decommissioning the Springbank Dam is in accordance with the completed One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment Report. This consultant assignment is another step forward in building a sustainable city by promoting environmental improvements and enhancing the water quality of the Thames River.

Stantec Consulting Ltd have shown their competency and expertise with dam decommissioning projects of this type. It is recommended that Stantec Consulting Ltd be appointed the consulting engineers for the pre-design and detailed design of the springbank dam decommissioning.

Prepared by: Ashley Rammeloo, MMSc., P.Eng.  
Division Manager, Sewer Engineering

Submitted by: Scott Mathers, MPA, P.Eng.  
Director, Water and Wastewater

Recommended by: Kelly Scherr, P. Eng., MBA, FEC  
Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer
#21005

January 19, 2021
(Appoint Consulting Engineer)

Chair and Members
Civic Works Committee

RE: Springbank Dam Decommissioning
(Subledger WW210001)
Capital Project ES3068 - Springbank Dam Replace Gates and Erosion Control
Stantec Consulting Ltd. - $328,318.28 (excluding HST)

---

**Finance and Corporate Services Report on the Sources of Financing:**
Finance and Corporate Services confirms that the cost of this project can be accommodated within the financing available for it in the Capital Budget, and that, subject to the approval of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the detailed source of financing for this project is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Expenditures</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Committed To This Submission</th>
<th>Balance for Future Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1,611,438</td>
<td>1,277,342</td>
<td>334,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8,956,609</td>
<td>5,838,664</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Related Expenses</td>
<td>77,311</td>
<td>77,311</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,645,358</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,193,317</strong></td>
<td><strong>$334,096</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sources of Financing           |                  |                              |                         |
| Debeture By-law Number W.-1936-317 | 1,200,000       | 1,200,000                    | 0                       | 0                       |
| Drawdown from Sewage Works Reserve Fund | 2,866,079       | 2,866,079                    | 0                       | 0                       |
| Superbuild Funding             | 2,803,968       | 2,803,968                    | 0                       | 0                       |
| Other Contributions (Legal Settlement) | 3,775,311       | 323,270                      | 334,096                 | 3,117,945               |
| **Total Financing**            | **$10,645,358** | **$7,193,317**              | **$334,096**            | **$3,117,945**          |

**Financial Note:**

- Contract Price: $328,318
- Add: HST @13%: 42,681
- Total Contract Price Including Taxes: 370,999
- Less: HST Rebate: -36,903
- Net Contract Price: $334,096

---

Jason Davies
Manager of Financial Planning & Policy
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Report to Civic Works Committee

To: Chair and Members
   Civic Works Committee
From: Kelly Scherr, P. Eng., MBA, FEC, Managing Director,
      Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer
Subject: Amendments to the Traffic and Parking By-law
Date: January 19, 2021

Recommendation

That on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the proposed by-law, attached as Appendix ‘A’ BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on February 2, 2021, for the purpose of amending the Traffic and Parking By-law (PS-113).

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

The following report supports the 2019 to 2023 Strategic Plan through the strategic focus area of Building a Sustainable City by improving safety, traffic operations and residential parking needs in London’s neighbourhoods.

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

The Traffic and Parking By-law (PS-113) requires amendments (Appendix A) to address traffic safety, operations and parking concerns. The amendments in the following sections are proposed.

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

2.1 Prohibited Turns

It is recommended that ‘U-turn’ restrictions be implemented to address safety concerns on Bradley Avenue at the entrance to the White Oaks Public School from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday to Friday.

2.2 Stop and Yield Signs

Elias Street

   To address operational and safety concerns, it is recommended to replace the existing ‘yield sign’ with a ‘stop sign’ for Elias Street at Glasgow Street.

Colonel Talbot Subdivision

   All road accesses within Colonel Talbot Subdivision are open to traffic. It is recommended to amend ‘through highways’ to include the extension of Campbell Street N from James Street to its north limit. In addition, it is recommended ‘stop signs’ and ‘yield signs’ be installed at the following locations:

   Stop Signs
   • Bakervilla Street at Tripp Drive;
• Sugarmaple Cross at Winterberry Drive (north and south intersections); and
• Tripp Drive at Bakervilla Street.

Yield Signs
• Winterberry Place at Winterberry Drive (south intersection).

2.3 One-Way Streets
To ensure the safe movement of traffic, it is recommended that Winterberry Place be designated as a one-way street counterclockwise from Winterberry Drive.

2.4 Speed Limits
Due to a significant increase in development on Oxford Street W, it is recommended to reduce the posted speed from 70 m west of Gideon Drive to 550 m west of Sanatorium Road from 70 km/h to 60 km/h.

2.5 Area Speed Limit
To date four area speed limits have been signed as 40 km/hr. The following three area speed limit zones are being recommended for implementation:

• The East London area bounded by Adelaide Street North, Oxford Street East, Highbury Avenue North, Florence Street and York Street. Dundas Street from Egerton Street to Highbury Avenue North is a major road and should remain at 50 km/h. The London Transit Commission (LTC) agreed to include this area in their evaluation of the impact of the reduced speed limit on their operation.

• The North London area bounded by Wharncliffe Road North, Western Road, Richmond Street, Oxford Street East and Oxford Street West. Windermere Road between Western Road and Richmond Street is a major road and should remain at 50 km/h. This area does not impact any bus routes that LTC identified as a concern.

• The South-West London area bounded by Wonderland Road South, Southdale Road West, Southdale Road East, White Oak Road and Exeter Road. Bradley Avenue West and Wharncliffe Road South are major roads and should remain at their current posted speed limits. This area does not impact any bus routes that LTC identified as a concern.

Maps showing the proposed area speed limit can be found in Appendix B.

The East London area speed limit zone is adjacent to the previously approved Central London zone. It is recommended to reduce the speed limit on Queens Avenue and King Street between Colborne Street and Adelaide Street North to 40 km/h. This will provide a consistent speed limit between zones.

The LTC put the evaluation of the area speed limits on their operation on hold due to the Pandemic. The evaluation will be completed when bus ridership returns to pre-Pandemic levels.
Conclusion

Amendments are required to Schedule 2 (No Parking), Schedule 8 (Prohibited Turns) Schedule 10 (Stop Signs), Schedule 11 (Yield Signs), Schedule 12 (One Way Streets), Schedule 13 (Through Highways), Schedule 17 (Higher Speed Limits) and Schedule 17.3 (Area Speed Limits) to address the above changes.

Prepared by: Shane Maguire, P. Eng., Division Manager, Roadway Lighting and Traffic Control

Submitted by: Doug MacRae, P. Eng., MPA, Director, Roads and Transportation

Recommended by: Kelly Scherr, P. Eng., MBA, FEC, Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer

January 5, 2021

Attach: Appendix A – By-law to Amend the Traffic and Parking By-law (PS-113)
Appendix B – Area Speed Limit Zones

cc: Parking Office
APPENDIX A By-law to amend the Traffic and Parking By-law (PS-113)

Bill No.

By-law No. PS-113

A by-law to amend By-law PS-113 entitled, “A by-law to regulate traffic and the parking of motor vehicles in the City of London.”

WHEREAS subsection 10(2) paragraph 7. Of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, provides that a municipality may pass by-laws to provide any service or thing that the municipality considers necessary or desirable to the public;

AND WHEREAS subsection 5(3) of the Municipal Act, 2001, as amended, provides that a municipal power shall be exercised by by-law;

NOW THEREFORE the Municipal Council of The Corporation of the City of London enacts as follows:

1. Prohibited Turns

Schedule 8 (Prohibited Turns) of the By-law PS-113 is hereby amended by adding the following rows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1 Intersection</th>
<th>Column 2 Direction</th>
<th>Column 3 Prohibited Turn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Avenue a point 350 m east of Ernest Avenue</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>“U” Turn (7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday to Friday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Avenue a point 380 m east of Ernest Avenue</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>“U” Turn (7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday to Friday)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Stop Signs

Schedule 10 (Stop Signs) of the By-law PS-113 is hereby amended by adding the following rows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1 Traffic</th>
<th>Column 2 Street</th>
<th>Column 3 Intersection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Bakervilla Street</td>
<td>Tripp Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Elias Street</td>
<td>Glasgow Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound &amp;</td>
<td>Sugarmaple Cross</td>
<td>Winterberry Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Tripp Drive</td>
<td>Bakervilla Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Yield Signs

Schedule 11 (Yield Signs) of the By-law PS-113 is hereby amended by **deleting** the following row:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Elias Street</td>
<td>Glasgow Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule 11 (Yield Signs) of the By-law PS-113 is hereby amended by **adding** the following row:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Winterberry Place (south intersection)</td>
<td>Winterberry Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. One-Way Streets

Schedule 12 (One-way Streets) of the By-law PS-113 is hereby amended by **adding** the following row:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterberry Place</td>
<td>Winterberry Place (north intersection)</td>
<td>Winterberry Place (south intersection)</td>
<td>Westbound &amp; Eastbound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Through Highways

Schedule 13 (Through Highways) of the By-law PS-113 is hereby amended by **deleting** the following row:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Street</td>
<td>James Street except at the intersection thereof with David Street</td>
<td>Sunray Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule 13 (Through Highways) of the By-law PS-113 is hereby amended by **adding** the following rows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Street</td>
<td>Sunray Avenue</td>
<td>Wharncliffe Rd S except at the intersection thereof with David Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Street N</td>
<td>Wharncliffe Road S</td>
<td>North limit of Campbell Street N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Higher Speed Limits

Schedule 17 (Higher Speed Limits) of the By-law PS-113 is hereby amended by **deleting** the following rows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2 From</th>
<th>Column 3 To</th>
<th>Column 4 Maximum Rate of Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street W</td>
<td>A point 70 m west of Gideon Drive</td>
<td>A point 550 m west of Sanatorium Road</td>
<td>70 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street W</td>
<td>A point 550 m west of Sanatorium Road</td>
<td>A point 250 m west of Cherryhill Boulevard</td>
<td>60 km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule 17 (Higher Speed Limits) of the By-law PS-113 is hereby amended by **adding** the following row:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2 From</th>
<th>Column 3 To</th>
<th>Column 4 Maximum Rate of Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Street W</td>
<td>A point 70 m west of Gideon Drive</td>
<td>A point 250 m west of Cherryhill Boulevard</td>
<td>60 km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Area Speed Limits

Schedule 17.3 (Area Speed Limits) of the By-law PS-113 is hereby amended by **deleting** the following rows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1 Area Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wharncliffe Road North – Oxford Street West – Oxford Street East – Adelaide Street North – Hamilton Road – Horton Street East; excluding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) York Street from Thames River to Adelaide Street North,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) King Street from Colborne Street to Adelaide Street North,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Queens Avenue from Colborne Street to Adelaide Street North and;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Riverside Drive from Wharncliffe Road North to Thames Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule 17 (Higher Speed Limits) of the By-law PS-113 is hereby amended by **adding** the following rows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1 Area Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Street North - Oxford Street East - Highbury Avenue North - Florence Street - York Street excluding Dundas Street from Egerton Street to Highbury Avenue North</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 2 Maximum Rate of Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Limit</th>
<th>Maximum Rate of Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Road – Richmond Street – Windermere Road</td>
<td>40 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharncliffe Road North – Western Road – Windermere Road – Richmond Street – Oxford Street East – Oxford Street West</td>
<td>40 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharncliffe Road North – Oxford Street West– Oxford Street East – Adelaide Street North – Hamilton Road – Horton Street East; excluding:</td>
<td>40 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) York Street from Thames River to Adelaide Street North; and</td>
<td>40 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Riverside Drive from Wharncliffe Road North to Thames Street.</td>
<td>40 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderland Road South – Bradley Avenue West – Wharncliffe Road South</td>
<td>40 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderland Road South – Southdale Road West – Wharncliffe Road South</td>
<td>40 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderland Road South – Wharncliffe Road South – Southdale Road East - White Oak Road – Exeter Road</td>
<td>40 km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This by-law comes into force and effect on the day it is passed.

PASSED in Open Council on February 2, 2021

Ed Holder
Mayor

Catharine Saunders
City Clerk

First Reading – February 2, 2021
Second Reading – February 2, 2021
Third Reading – February 2, 2021
APPENDIX B: Area Speed Limit Zones

East London
40 km/h Area Speed Limit

LEGEND
- Arterial Boundary Road
- Park/Green Space
- Arterial Road
  (speed limit marked on map)

North London
40 km/h Area Speed Limit

LEGEND
- Arterial Boundary Road
- Park/Green Space
- 50 km/h Arterial Road
- Private Property
  (not part of the ASL)
Report to Civic Works Committee

To: Chair and Members
Civic Works Committee

From: Kelly Scherr, P.Eng., MBA, FEC
Managing Director, Environmental & Engineering Services
and City Engineer

Subject: RFP20-72 Supply & Delivery of Medium Duty Crew Cab Trucks
Date: January 19, 2021

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services & City Engineer,

a) The submission from Carrier Centers, 90 Enterprise Drive, London, Ontario, N6N 1A8, BE ACCEPTED for the supply and delivery of four (4) medium duty crew cab trucks at a total purchase price of $578,955, excluding HST, in accordance with Section 12.2 b) of the Goods and Services Policy which states: Awards under the Request for Approval (RFP) process require the following approval: Committee and City Council must approve an RFP award for purchases greater than $100,000;

b) Fleet Services BE AUTHORIZED to award a contract term of one (1) year for the replacement of (4) four units in 2021, with three (3) option years to replace nine (9) units in 2022, and ten (10) units in 2023 as per the replacement schedule approved in the 2020-2023 capital budget, funded by ME202201 and ME202301 capital projects;

c) Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all the administrative acts that are necessary in connection with these purchases;

d) Approval hereby given BE CONDITIONAL upon the Corporation entering into a formal contract or having a purchase order, or contract record relating to the subject matter of this approval in accordance with Section 12.2 b) of the Goods and Services Policy which states: Awards under the RFP process require the following approval: Committee and City Council must approve an RFP award for purchases greater than $100,000; and

e) That the funding for this purchase BE APPROVED as set out in the Source of Financing Report attached hereto as Appendix A.

Executive Summary

This report recommends the award of a vendor of record contract for one (1) year with three (3), one-year options to the highest scoring proponent of RFP20-72, Carrier Centers. The RFP was issued by Purchasing & Supply and four (4) proposals were submitted for evaluation by Fleet Planning and Fleet Maintenance.

This report discusses the background, purchasing process and evaluation criteria, and financial impact considered in the recommendation to award to the highest scoring proponent.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

Building a Sustainable City
London’s infrastructure is built, maintained, and operated to meet long-term needs of our community
- Manage assets to prevent future infrastructure gaps
Leading in Public Service
Londoners experience exceptional and valued customer service
- Increase responsiveness to our customers
- Increase efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

On an annual basis, Fleet Services reviews and replaces vehicles and equipment that have reached the end of their optimum life cycle. This RFP was initiated to replace two (2) single axle medium duty crew cab work trucks with dump bodies, one with a deck mounted crane. One unit supports Roadside Operations, the second unit supports Sewer Operations. Included in the RFP were two (2) additional single axle medium duty crew cab work trucks that received funding approval through assessment growth.

These types of trucks are crew trucks. Three are used by Sewer Operations in a wide variety of material handling tasks year-round for regular and emergency response duties. The units are critical for service delivery as they haul waste material away from multiple project sites and the cranes are also used for various rigging applications and to move and manipulate materials so they can be placed safely and accurately.

As part of the replacement process, Roadside and Sewer Operations staff were consulted to determine if operation needs were being met by the current vehicle design and if any changes were required. Some changes to enhance ergonomics and operator safety were made, and Health and Safety reviewed and approved the final specifications.

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

2.1 Purchasing Process

Due to the complexity and various configurations and box designs available in this class of equipment, it was decided to use a RFP procurement process to encourage bidders to be creative and apply their expertise to ensure the best overall value for the service area and the City was realized.

Fleet Planning, through Purchasing and Supply, initiated the proposal process for four (4) medium duty crew cab trucks on November 3, 2020. The RFP closed on December 3, 2020 and resulted in four compliant bids to evaluate.

2.2 Evaluation and Results

The evaluation team was chaired by a Procurement Officer and consisted of representatives from Fleet Maintenance and Fleet Planning. The evaluation criteria, weighting and the scoring is listed below:

- Mandatory Appendix E - Pass/Fail
- Company Certification, Experience and Past Performance - 15% weighting
- Specifications - 40% weighting
- Efficiency, Safety and Regulatory Compliance - 10% weighting
- Service Support, Delivery, Training, and Warranty - 10% weighting
- Price - 25% weighting

The evaluation determined that the proposal from Carrier Centers, with Commander Industries as the body subcontractor, was the highest scoring proposal and was also the lowest priced proposal.
2.3 Disposal of Decommissioned Units

Bidders were asked to provide details on trade-in options of the retiring units. Carrier Centers was the only bidder to submit optional trade-in values. The trade values were determined to be insufficient to meet Fleet Planning’s salvage target so the retiring units will be sold at public auction.

3.0 Financial Impact

3.1 Project Budget

Funding to replace two (2) medium duty crew cab trucks was originally budgeted and approved in the 2016-2019 Multi-Year Budget at an estimated total cost of $208,000 via capital projects ME201701 and ME201901. The two (2) additional units were approved through the 2020-2023 Multi-Year Budget at an estimated $282,000 funded via ES5020 and ES5021.

The recommended bid from Carrier Centers is $578,955 (excluding HST) for all four units. The following table lists the budgeted amount, the actual cost, and the variance for each of the four units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>$117,125</td>
<td>-$21,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$141,680</td>
<td>-$29,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$147,130</td>
<td>-$12,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$147,000</td>
<td>$173,020</td>
<td>-$26,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$578,955</td>
<td>-$88,955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Project Funding

The variance of $88,955 is attributed to continued market changes in the heavy truck and body building industry. Challenges include increased supply chain costs due to the pandemic, costs of raw materials, currency exchange rates, environmental control systems, trade and tariff pressures and general inflationary increases across the board in the manufacturing sector.

Additional funding of $50,805 for the first two units is available in capital project ME201801. Additional funding of $38,150 for the third and fourth units is available in their respective capital project (ES5020 and ES5021).

Ongoing operating costs for fuel, maintenance, inspection/service, overhead and future capital replacement are funded through the internal rental rate process and charged to the service areas. The amounts are calculated based on future replacement costs and historical cost experience for similar units in those equipment classes.

Source of Financing is attached as Appendix A.

Conclusion

Based on the discussion and analysis above, Fleet Services, in conjunction with Purchasing and Supply, recommend that RFP20-72 for the Supply and Delivery of Medium Duty Crew Cab Trucks be awarded to Carrier Centers, 90 Enterprise Drive, London, Ontario, N6N 1A8. The recommendation also includes awarding a vendor of record contract to Carrier Centres for one (1) year with three (3) option years.

The Carrier Centers submission scored the highest in the RFP evaluation based on the evaluation criteria, and staff from Fleet Maintenance and Fleet Planning have confidence in the selection and believe the recommended vendor and product provide the best overall value for the City of London.
Appendix A – Source of Financing
#21004
January 19, 2021
(Award Contract)

Chair and Members
Civic Works Committee

RE: RFP20-72 Supply and Delivery of Medium Duty Crew Cab Trucks
Capital Project ME201701 - Vehicles and Equipment Replacement - TCA (Work Order 2487307)
Capital Project ME201801 - Vehicles and Equipment Replacement - TCA (Work Order 2487306, 2487307)
Capital Project ME201901 - Vehicles and Equipment Replacement - TCA (Work Order 2487306)
Capital Project ES5020 - Sewer Operations Equipment - Stormwater (Work Order 2497972)
Capital Project ES5021 - Sewer Operations Vehicles and Equipment - WWT (Work Order 2498031)
Carrier Centers - $578,955.00 (excluding HST)

Finance and Corporate Services Report on the Sources of Financing:
Finance and Corporate Services confirms that the cost of this purchase can be accommodated within the financing available for it in the Capital Budget, and that, subject to the approval of Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services, and City engineer, the detailed source of financing is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Expenditures</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Committed To This Submission</th>
<th>Balance for Future Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME201701 - Vehicles and Equipment Replacement - TCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and Equipment</td>
<td>5,034,705</td>
<td>4,672,185</td>
<td>264,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME201801 - Vehicles and Equipment Replacement - TCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and Equipment</td>
<td>6,469,253</td>
<td>5,466,635</td>
<td>960,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME201901 - Vehicles and Equipment Replacement - TCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and Equipment</td>
<td>5,753,272</td>
<td>5,424,272</td>
<td>215,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES5020 - Sewer Operations Equipment - Stormwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and Equipment</td>
<td>323,311</td>
<td>149,720</td>
<td>173,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES5021 - Sewer Operations Vehicles and Equipment - WWT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and Equipment</td>
<td>189,844</td>
<td>176,066</td>
<td>13,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,770,385</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,553,092</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,628,146</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Financing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME201701 - Vehicles and Equipment Replacement - TCA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Levy</td>
<td>45,558</td>
<td>45,558</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Vehicles and Equipment Reserve Fund</td>
<td>4,944,717</td>
<td>4,582,197</td>
<td>264,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Self Insurance Reserve Fund</td>
<td>44,430</td>
<td>44,430</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME201701 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,034,705</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,672,185</strong></td>
<td><strong>$97,690</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME201801 - Vehicles and Equipment Replacement - TCA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Levy</td>
<td>260,862</td>
<td>260,862</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Vehicles and Equipment Reserve Fund</td>
<td>6,165,891</td>
<td>5,153,273</td>
<td>960,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Self Insurance Reserve Fund</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME201801 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,469,253</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,456,635</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix "A"

January 19, 2021
(Award Contract)

Chair and Members
Civic Works Committee

RE: RFP20-72 Supply and Delivery of Medium Duty Crew Cab Trucks
Capital Project ME201701 - Vehicles and Equipment Replacement - TCA (Work Order 2487307)
Capital Project ME201801 - Vehicles and Equipment Replacement - TCA (Work Order 2487306, 2487307)
Capital Project ME201901 - Vehicles and Equipment Replacement - TCA (Work Order 2487306)
Capital Project ES5020 - Sewer Operations Equipment - Stormwater (Work Order 2497972)
Capital Project ES5021 - Sewer Operations Vehicles and Equipment - WWT (Work Order 2498031)
Carrier Centers - $578,955.00 (excluding HST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Financing</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Committed To Date</th>
<th>This Submission</th>
<th>Balance for Future Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME201901 - Vehicles and Equipment Replacement - TCA</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawdown from Vehicles and Equipment Reserve Fund</td>
<td>5,588,225</td>
<td>5,259,225</td>
<td>113,971</td>
<td>215,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributions</td>
<td>40,047</td>
<td>40,047</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME201901 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,753,272</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,424,272</strong></td>
<td><strong>$113,971</strong></td>
<td><strong>$215,029</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ES5020 - Sewer Operations Equipment - Stormwater | | | | |
| Drawdown from Sewage Works Renewal Reserve Fund | 323,311 | 0 | 149,720 | 173,591 |

| ES5021 - Sewer Operations Vehicles and Equipment - WWT | | | | |
| Drawdown from Sewage Works Renewal Reserve Fund | 189,844 | 0 | 176,066 | 13,778 |

| Total Financing | **$17,770,385** | **$15,553,092** | **$589,147** | **$1,628,146** |

| Financial Note: |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| ME201701        | ME201801        | ME201901        | ES5020          |
| Contract Price  | $96,000         | $50,805         | $112,000        | $147,130        |
| Add: HST @13%   | 12,480          | 6,605           | 14,560          | 19,127          |
| Total Contract Price Including Taxes | 108,480 | 67,410 | 126,560 | 166,257 |
| Less: HST Rebate | -10,790         | -5,710          | -12,589         | -16,537         |
| Net Contract Price | $97,690         | $51,700         | $113,971        | $149,720        |

| Financial Note Continued: |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| ES5021          | Total           | | | |
| Contract Price  | $173,020         | $578,955        | | |
| Add: HST @13%   | 22,493           | 75,265          | | |
| Total Contract Price Including Taxes | 195,513 | 654,220 | | |
| Less: HST Rebate | -19,447         | -65,073         | | |
| Net Contract Price | $176,066         | $589,147        | | |

**Note 1:** Purchases made in the future, funded by ME202201 and ME202301, will be included in a future source of financing.

**Jason Davies**
Manager of Financial Planning & Policy
To: Chair and Members Civic Works Committee  
From: George Kotsifas, Managing Director, Development and Compliance Services & Chief Building Official  
Subject: Street Renaming portion of Darlington Place (Plan 33M-773)  
Date: January 19, 2021

Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Sifton Properties Limited for the proposed renaming of Darlington Place:

a) the portion of “Darlington Place” from Kettering Place southward to Lot 9, Concession 1, Part 2 of Reference Plan 33R-19902, within Registered Plan 33M-773, BE RENAMED to “Barn Swallow Place.”

Executive Summary

Sifton Properties has requested that “Darlington Place” in the approved subdivision 33M-773 be renamed to “Barn Swallow Place.” Darlington Place was intended to be a north-south street serving as a connection between two subdivisions. With the lands to the immediate south of the registered subdivision proceeding to Draft Plan Approval and eventual registration, the renaming would align with the developer’s requested street name for the lands under review.

The requested renaming conforms to the City’s Street Naming Guidelines and no objections have been noted by the Municipal Addressing Advisory Group (MAAG).

To date, no addresses have been created for Darlington Place and street signs have not been installed. Approval of the request would result in effectively a technical amendment to the established street name and no costs are required for signage or compensation for property owners.

If the renaming is approved, “Darlington Place” would return to the City’s list of available street names for future assignment.

Linkage to the Corporate Strategic Plan

Building a Sustainable City - London’s growth and development is well planned and sustainable over the long term.

Analysis

1.0 Background Information

1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

A Draft Plan application for the “Victoria on the River” subdivision was accepted on July 31, 2009. A revised plan was submitted on September 23, 2010 and the statutory public meeting was held on March 28, 2011. Council adopted the corresponding Official Plan Amendment on April 4, 2011 and it came into effect on May 10th as there were no appeals. The plan was Draft Approved on January 19, 2012, subject to conditions and red line revisions.

Further revisions to the Draft Plan, including technical amendments required as a result of the final design of the stormwater management pond and outlets were considered at a
public participation meeting on September 10, 2013 and a revised Draft Approval was
granted on December 10, 2013 for the plan of subdivision consisting of 152 single family
lots as well as several blocks for medium and low density residential development,
stormwater management and open space uses, and one commercial block.

Phase 1, being the Stormwater Management Pond, was registered on July 26, 2013.
Phase 2, which consisted of 59 single detached residential lots, one multi-family block
and several park/open space blocks, was registered as Plan 33M-672 on July 31st, 2014.
Phase 3 of the subdivision, which consists of 60 single detached residential lots and one
park block, was registered as Plan 33M-688 on November 19, 2015.

In April 2016, the Approval Authority granted a further revision to the Draft Plan to Divide
a Multi-Family Block and create 20 single detached lots. Phase 4 consisted of 48 single
family detached lots, 3 multi-family medium density blocks, 1 walkway block and 1 reserve
block.

On December 16, 2019, Phase 5 was registered as 33M-773 as one phase, consisting of
5 single detached lots, one multi-family block and 5 single detached family blocks, all
served by two new streets, being Kettering Place and Constance Avenue. On December
19, 2019, a Final Addressing Plan approving the street names of Constance Avenue,
Kettering Place and Darlington Place and registered as such on the face of the Registered
Plan 33M-773.

An application to change the street name was accepted by The Corporation of the City of
London on September 14, 2020 from Sifton Properties Limited, requesting that the street
name be changed from Darlington Place to Barn Swallow Place. Sifton Properties Limited
have a subdivision plan submitted for the lands to the south, as a result of a request from
the former property owner, Sifton’s are proposing that Darlington Place be renamed to
Barn Swallow Place as it has a connection to the original owners and history / attributes
of the site.

2.0 Discussion and Considerations

The requested renaming conforms to the City’s Street Naming Guidelines and no
objections have been noted by the Municipal Addressing Advisory Group (MAAG).

To date, no addresses have been created for Darlington Place and street signs have not
been installed. Approval of the request would effectively result in a technical amendment
to the established street name and no costs are required for signage or compensation for
property owners.

If the renaming is approved, “Darlington Place” would return to the City’s list of available
street names for future assignment.
Figure 1 below, Location map of Darlington Place to be renamed to Barn Swallow Place.
Figure 2 below, Copy of Plan 33M-786, showing location of Darlington Place.
3.0 Financial Impact/Considerations

Per the Street Naming Guidelines, the applicant is required to fully cover the costs and provide compensation to residents affected by the street renaming.

There are no residents or street signs installed, therefore there is no direct financial impact to the applicant or the City.

4.0 Key Issues and Considerations

There are no key issues or considerations with this application.

Conclusion

With the approval of the recommended Street Renaming, as directed by Council, Civic Administration will proceed to rename Darlington Place on Plan 33M-773 to Barn Swallow Place.

Prepared by: June-Anne Reid, Development Documentation Coordinator
Recommended by: Paul Yeoman, RPP, PLE, Director, Development Services
Submitted by: George Kotsifas, P.Eng., Managing Director Development & Compliance Services and Chief Building Official
The Issue. (Aldersbrook Gate London)

Implementing speed bumps on Aldersbrook Gate.

Background.
The amount of traffic using Aldersbrook Gate in general and as a cut through to main thoroughfares has been an issue for several years for many residents on this short street.

Concerned residents have made many suggestions to City Hall Officials to alleviate the traffic issue. Some if not all, would have minimal cost associated with the implementation of these suggested measures.

After several meetings with City Officials, all of these alternative suggestions were rejected by City Officials. To date there has been no clear reasons given for denying the suggested alternatives.

The only option City Officials would consider was implementing speed bumps on Aldersbrook Gate.

City Officials indicated implementing the speed bumps would require a vote by all residents of Aldersbrook Gate.

The first vote was scheduled for the spring in 2020. Due to the Covid 19 pandemic that vote was postponed until later.

In the fall of 2020 a second ballot was sent to residents. However, that ballot did not contain a pre-paid stamped return envelope.

Another ballot was sent out with the proper requirements included. The vote and ballots cast were supposed to be completed by December 18 2020.

In these communications to residents the question/issue to be voted on was clearly indicated in the notice sent to residents. It states in part:
In order to proceed with this project a minimum of 51% of residents must vote in favour of installing the speed cushions. “IF YOU DO NOT VOTE YOU ARE ASSUMED TO BE A NO VOTE”

It has to be stated at this point that the general traffic volume and cut through traffic causing the issues, has to lie at the door of the City Planning process.

For many years this area was mostly farm land. The City authorized and approved multiple residential and commercial projects surrounding Aldersbrook Gate.

In this planning and approval process, little or no thought was given to the effect all of the additional traffic from these increased dwellings and commercial properties would have on the residents of this street.

The increase in residential and commercial builds that occurred is due in main part to the fact Aldersbrook Gate was the only way for vehicles to access the main thoroughfares. This was their only available access thereby increasing the traffic and cut through traffic volume.

Dalmagarry was opened many years later. However, that has proved to have little effect on the traffic volume on Aldersbrook Gate.

Returning to the policy at issue in this matter where it states “persons who do not vote will be assumed to be a no vote”.

I strongly suggest the City policy that dictates such a formula is not defendable, and seriously interferes with the democratic voting process.

Simply put, the City cannot “deem” people who did not vote to be automatically considered a “no vote”

By doing so, you are in fact engaging and casting a vote you are not entitled to do, which affects the result of a democratic voting process.

The issue was clearly identified to all eligible voters, and each voter was given the opportunity to cast a vote either in favour or against the proposition being proposed.

Residents who did not vote may have many reasons for not doing so.

1) They may not care or have a position one way or another regarding the proposition being voted on.

2) They may simply do not believe in any voting process, and will never cast a vote in any election.

That is their choice which should not be interfered with. If they choose not to vote their choice should be respected and accepted by City Officials, in addition, City Officials and every one of the residents who took the time to vote should accept the result of votes received, and the
majority of votes received will be the only determining factor as to whether speed bumps on Aldersbrook Gate are implemented.

Those who chose not to vote can have no recourse, and will have to accept the result of the democratic process. All voters were given equal opportunity to make their wishes known and will have to live with the result.

It certainly is not up to City Officials or anyone else to change an absent vote into a “no vote”

That simply is an unreasonable and an unwarranted interference in the democratic process.

Most if not all elections and parliamentary processes are carried out in accordance with “Roberts Rules”

My understanding of the basic principles of these rules are as follows:

1) Abstentions are counted and noted but not as a “yes” or “no” vote.
2) An abstention does not affect the voting result.
3) A person has a right to abstain and cannot be compelled to vote.
4) A person has an obligation to abstain if he or she has a direct personal interest in the matter that amounts to a legal conflict.
   In assuming non-votes to be deemed to be “no votes” it appears that this policy conflicts with the rules mentioned above.

Several courts have also weighed in on similar processes regarding protecting the democratic process, below are some excerpts which I believe supports a strong belief that the democratic process must be followed and protected

Courts have listed some additional principles. In Di Biase v. Vaughan (City) (2007), 43 M.P.L.R. (4th) 287 (S.C.J.) at para. 15, the City clerk formulated the following list of principles:

(i) The secrecy and confidentiality of the voting process is paramount;
(ii) The election shall be fair and non-biased;
(iii) The election shall be accessible to the voters;
(iv) The integrity of the process shall be maintained throughout the election;
(v) There is to be certainty that the results of the election reflect the votes cast; and
(vi) Voters and candidates shall be treated fairly and consistently.

All forms of democratic government are founded upon the right to vote. Without that right, democracy cannot exist. The marking of a ballot is the mark of distinction of citizens of a democracy. It is a proud badge of freedom. While the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees certain electoral rights, the right to vote is generally granted and defined by statute. That statutory right is so fundamental that a broad and liberal interpretation must be given to
Every reasonable effort should be made to enfranchise citizens. Conversely, every care should be taken to guard against disenfranchisement.

In Raeburn v. Lorje (2000), 95 A.C.W.S. (3d) 655 (Sask. Q.B.), Hunter J. stated at para. 48: The will of the electorate as expressed by their votes in the election is not to be lightly interfered with.

Wrzenewskyj vs, Attorney General of Canada (2012 SCR (3)

In the final analysis, I believe that the Court was correct in Haig [v. Canada, [1993] 2 S.C.R. 995], to define s. 3 with reference to the right of each citizen to play a meaningful role in the electoral process.

(J. P. Boyer, Election Law in Canada: The Law and Procedure of Federal, Provincial and Territorial Elections (1987), of course, is a form of government in which sovereign power resides in the people as a whole. In our system of democracy, this means that each citizen must have a genuine opportunity to take part in the governance of the country through participation in the selection of elected representatives. The fundamental purpose of s. 3, in my view, is to promote and protect the right of each citizen to play a meaningful role in the political life of the country. Absent such a right, ours would not be a true democracy.

In conclusion, I am strongly requesting the City Officials review this policy and change it to reflect a true democratic process which is all votes cast and received determine the outcome.

I also ask the results of the recent vote be held in abeyance until this policy has been amended or voted on by City Council.

Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Thank you for your assistance in changing this policy and restoring this process to reflect a true democratic outcome.

Best Regards

Alex Mercer

1819 Aldersbrook Gate

London Ont.
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## DEFERRED MATTERS

### CIVIC WORKS COMMITTEE

**as of January 7, 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>Requested/Expected Reply Date</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Rapid Transit Corridor Traffic Flow</strong></td>
<td>December 12, 2016</td>
<td>Q4, 2020</td>
<td>K. Scherr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to report back on the feasibility of implementing specific pick-up and drop-off times for services, such as deliveries and curbside pick-up of recycling and waste collection to local businesses in the downtown area and in particular, along the proposed rapid transit corridors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Dann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Garbage and Recycling Collection and Next Steps</strong></td>
<td>January 10, 2017</td>
<td>Q1, 2021</td>
<td>K. Scherr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, with the support of the Director, Environment, Fleet and Solid Waste, the following actions be taken with respect to the garbage and recycling collection and next steps:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Stanford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to report back to Civic Works Committee by December 2017 with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) a Business Case including a detailed feasibility study of options and potential next steps to change the City’s fleet of garbage packers from diesel to compressed natural gas (CNG); and,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) an Options Report for the introduction of a semi or fully automated garbage collection system including considerations for customers and operational impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Bike Share System for London – Update and Next Steps</strong></td>
<td>August 12, 2019</td>
<td>Q1, 2021</td>
<td>K. Scherr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File No.</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Request Date</td>
<td>Requested/Expected Reply Date</td>
<td>Person Responsible</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to finalize the bike share business case and prepare a draft implementation plan for a bike share system in London, including identifying potential partners, an operations plan, a marketing plan and financing strategies, and submit to Civic Works Committee by January 2020; it being noted that a communication from C. Butler, dated August 8, 2019, with respect to the above matter was received.</td>
<td>October 2, 2018</td>
<td>Q2, 2021</td>
<td>K. Scherr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>745-747 Waterloo Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the application of The Y Group Investments and Management Inc., relating to the property located at 745-747 Waterloo Street:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to review, in consultation with the neighbourhood, the traffic and parking congestion concerns raised by the neighbourhood and to report back at a future Planning and Environment Committee meeting;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it being further noted that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications with respect to this matter:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a communication from B. and J. Baskerville, by e-mail; a communication from C. Butler, 863 Waterloo Street; and, a communication from L. Neumann and D. Cummings, Co-Chairs, Piccadilly Area Neighbourhood Association;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters; it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the recommended Zoning By-law Amendment would allow for the reuse of the existing buildings with an expanded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File No.</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Request Date</td>
<td>Requested/Expected Reply Date</td>
<td>Person Responsible</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>range of office conversion uses that are complementary to the continued development of Oxford Street as an Urban Corridor, consistent with The London Plan polices for the subject site. Limiting the requested Zoning By-law Amendment to the existing buildings helps to ensure compatibility with the surrounding heritage resources and also that the requested parking and landscaped area deficiencies would not be perpetuated should the site be redeveloped in the future. While the requested parking deficiency is less than the minimum required by zoning, it is reflective of the existing conditions. By restricting the office conversion uses to the ground floor of the existing building at 745 Waterloo Street and the entirety of the existing building at 747 Waterloo Street (rather than the entirety of both buildings, as requested by the applicant), the parking requirements for the site would be less than the parking requirements for the existing permitted uses. The applicant has indicated a willingness to accept the special provisions limiting the permitted uses to the ground floor of the existing building at 745 Waterloo Street and to the entirety of the existing building at 747 Waterloo Street.</td>
<td>June 18, 2019</td>
<td>Q4, 2020</td>
<td>K. Scherr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Best Practices for Investing in Energy Efficiency and GHG Reduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to develop a set of guidelines to evaluate efficiency and Greenhouse Gas reduction investments and provide some suggested best practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>MADD Canada Memorial Sign</strong></td>
<td>July 14, 2020</td>
<td>Q4, 2021</td>
<td>D. MacRae A. Salton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That the following actions be taken with respect to the memorial sign request submitted by Shauna and David Andrews, dated June 1, 2020, and supported by Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) Canada:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to engage in discussions with MADD Canada regarding MADD Canada Memorial Signs and bring forward a proposed Memorandum of Understanding with MADD Canada for Council’s approval;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it being noted that MADD will cover all sign manufacturing and installation costs;

it being further noted that the Ministry of Transportation and MADD have set out in this Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") the terms and conditions for the placement of memorial signs on provincial highways which is not applicable to municipal roads;

it being further noted that MADD provides messages consistent with the London Road Safety Strategy; and,

b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to work with MADD Canada to find a single permanent location in London for the purpose of memorials.

7. **Street Renaming By-law, Policies and Guidelines**
   That the following actions be taken with respect to the street renaming of Plantation Road:
   
b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to undertake a review of City’s By-laws, Policies and Guidelines relating to street naming processes and approvals and report back to the Civic Works Committee on any recommended changes to the process(es) that would support and implement the City’s commitment to eradicate anti-Black, anti-Indigenous and people of colour oppression; it being noted that the report back is to include a review of the request set out in the above-noted petition, recognizing that, historically, the word “Plantation” has a strong correlation to slavery, oppression and racism;

8. **Updates - 60% Waste Diversion Action Plan Including Green Bin Program**
   d) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to:
   
i) continue to prioritize work activities and actions that also contribute to the work of the London Community Recovery Network; and,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>Requested/Expected Reply Date</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) submit a report to the Civic Works Committee by June 2021 that outlines advantages, disadvantages, and implementation scenarios for various waste reduction and reuse initiatives, including but not limited to, reducing the container limit, examining the use of clear bags for garbage, mandatory recycling by-laws, reward and incentive systems, and additional user fees.</td>
<td>November 17, 2020</td>
<td>February 9, 2021</td>
<td>K. Scherr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Community Engagement on Green Bin Program Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Stanford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the following actions be taken with respect to the staff report dated November 17, 2020, related to Community Engagement on the Green Bin Program Design:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) the above-noted staff report BE RECEIVED; and,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to submit a report to the Civic Works Committee on February 9, 2021 and include the results of public input, staff recommendations to move forward and the proposed next steps for the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That the request for delegation status from L. Brown, Blue Community Committee, with respect to the Blue Community Project/Movement BE APPROVED for a future meeting of the Civic Works Committee; it being noted that the Civic Administration will bring forward a staff report to coincide with the above-noted delegation; it being further noted that a communication from L. Brown was received with respect to this matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City Clerks Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>