



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Appendix 2

Number:

Project Name: **Berczy Beckett East Parkette - Design**

Project Cost: **\$39,200**

Commission: Development Services

Ranking: 2 New Asset/Expansion

Department: Design

Useful Life: 25

Project Mgr: Linda Irvine

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

Category: Major

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐

5 ☐ 6 ☒ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

### DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

To hire the landscape architect to provide full service landscape architectural services for this 0.71 ac / 0.29 ha parkette in Upper Unionville. Construction funding requested in 2016. Anticipated park amenities include a children's tot lot, shade structure, seating, walkways and associated landscaping.

### BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.

Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide park amenities commensurate with rapid residential growth.

### PROJECT COSTS (\$)

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	0	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	36,000	0
Contingency %: 7	<u>2,520</u>	<u>0</u>
Sub Total:	<u>38,520</u>	<u>0</u>
HST Impact:	<u>678</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Project Cost:	<u>39,200</u>	<u>0</u>

### NOTES

Intention is for pre-approval of design in order to tender in early 2016 for spring 2016 construction start.

### PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	35,280	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-DC Growth	3,920	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>39,200</u>				<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

### OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Berczy Beckett East Parkette - Design

**DCA**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Amount in Study</u>	<u>Life Cycle</u>
Parks-Berczy Beckett East Parkette	2015	35,280	647,311	Amount in Study: <input type="text"/>
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<u>35,280</u>	<u>647,311</u>	Amount Incl HST <input type="text"/>
				Year in the study <input type="text"/>

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

Remaining funds in the amount of \$608,071 to be used for construction in 2016.

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$30,000
Quarter 2:	\$9,200
Quarter 3:	\$0
Quarter 4:	\$0
<b>Year 1 Total Cash Flow:</b>	<b>\$39,200</b>
Year 2:	\$0
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
<b>Total All Years:</b>	<b>\$39,200</b>

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:   
RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

**Estimated 2016 Deliverables**

Park completion in 2016.

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Residential community is built out and park facilities need to be provided.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Residents would be underserved.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None.



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Berczy Beckett NE parkette - DesignProject Cost: \$24,500Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: DesignUseful Life: 25Project Mgr: Linda IrvineCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐Category: Major5 ☐ 6 ☒ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Cost Validation: Recent awardsRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

To hire the landscape architect to provide full service landscape architectural services for this 0.42 ac / 0.17 ha parkette in Upper Unionville. Construction funding requested in 2016. Anticipated park amenities include a children's tot-lot, seating walkways and associated landscaping.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide park amenities commensurate with rapid residential growth.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	0	225,000
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	22,500	0
Contingency %: 7	1,575	15,750
Sub Total:	24,075	240,750
HST Impact:	424	4,237
Total Project Cost:	<u>24,500</u>	<u>245,000</u>

**NOTES**

Intention is for pre-approval of design in order to tender in the early 2016 for a spring 2016 construction start.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	22,050	0	0	0	0	0	220,500
Non-DC Growth	2,450	0	0	0	0	0	24,500
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>24,500</u>				<u>0</u>		<u>245,000</u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Berczy Beckett NE parkette - Design

**DCA**

**Name**

Parks-Berczy Beckett NE Parkette

**Year**

2015

**Amount**

22,050

**Amount in Study**

316,019

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study:

**TOTAL FUNDING**

22,050

316,019

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1: \$4,500

Quarter 2: \$10,000

Quarter 3: \$10,000

Quarter 4: \$0

Year 1 Total Cash Flow: \$24,500

Year 2: \$0

Year 3 + beyond: \$0

Total All Years: \$24,500

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

10/16/2015

RFP/Tender Award by:

11/13/2015

Estimated Project Completion Date:

11/11/2016

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class: Multi-phase – First Year

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Residential community is being built out and park facilities are needed.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Residents will be underserved.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None.



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Berczy Beckett NE Parkette - ConstructionProject Cost: \$245,000Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: DesignUseful Life: 0Project Mgr: Linda IrvineCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐5 ☐ 6 ☒ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Category: MajorCost Validation: Recent awardsRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

To hire the contractor to construct this 0.42 ac / 0.17 ha parkette in Upper Unionville. Design funding requested in 2016.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide park amenities commensurate with rapid residential growth.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	225,000	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 7	15,750	0
Sub Total:	240,750	0
HST Impact:	4,237	0
Total Project Cost:	245,000	0

**NOTES**

Anticipated park amenities include a children's tot-lot, seating walkways and associated landscaping.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	220,500	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-DC Growth	24,500	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>245,000</u>				<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Berczy Beckett NE Parkette - Construction

**DCA**

**Name**

Parks-Berczy Beckett NE Parkette

**TOTAL FUNDING**

**Year**

2015

**Amount**

220,500

**Amount in  
Study**

316,019

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study:

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1: \$0

Quarter 2: \$100,000

Quarter 3: \$100,000

Quarter 4: \$45,000

Year 1 Total Cash Flow: \$245,000

Year 2: \$0

Year 3 + beyond: \$0

Total All Years: \$245,000

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Residential community is building out and park facilities need to be provided.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Residents will be underserved.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Berczy Beckett Neighborhood Park - DesignProject Cost: \$73,500Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: DesignUseful Life: 25Project Mgr: Linda IrvineCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐Category: Major5 ☐ 6 ☒ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Cost Validation: Recent awardsRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

### DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

To hire the landscape architect to provide full service landscape architectural services for this 1.53 ac / 0.62 ha park in Upper Unionville. Construction funding is requested in 2016. Anticipated park amenities include a children's junior/senior playground, shade structure, adult fitness equipment, seating, tables, and associated landscaping.

### BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.

Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide park amenities commensurate with rapid residential growth.

### PROJECT COSTS (\$)

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	0	675,000
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	67,500	0
Contingency %: 7	4,725	47,250
Sub Total:	72,225	722,250
HST Impact:	1,271	12,712
Total Project Cost:	<u>73,500</u>	<u>735,000</u>

### NOTES

The intention is for pre-approval of the design in order to tender in early 2016 for a spring 2016 construction start.

### PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	66,150	0	0	0	0	0	661,500
Non-DC Growth	7,350	0	0	0	0	0	73,500
TOTAL FUNDING	<u>73,500</u>				<u>0</u>		<u>735,000</u>

### OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Berczy Beckett Neighborhood Park - Design

**DCA**

**Name**

Parks-Berczy Beckett Neighbourhood Park

**Year**

2015

**Amount**

66,150

**Amount in**

**Study**

1,222,223

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study:

**TOTAL FUNDING**

66,150

1,222,223

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

Remaining funds in the amount of \$1,148,693 to be used for construction in 2016.

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1: \$18,500

Quarter 2: \$18,500

Quarter 3: \$18,500

Quarter 4: \$10,300

Year 1 Total Cash Flow: \$65,800

Year 2: \$7,700

Year 3 + beyond: \$0

Total All Years: \$73,500

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Residential community is building out and park facilities need to be provided.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Residents will be underserved.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None





# 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Berczy Beckett NW Park (Next to School) - DesignProject Cost: \$73,500Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: DesignUseful Life: 25Project Mgr: Linda IrvineCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐5 ☐ 6 ☒ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Category: MajorCost Validation: Recent awardsRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

This is to hire the landscape architect to provide full landscape architectural services for this 1.97 ac / 0.80 park next to the new Berczy Farm Public School in Upper Unionville. Anticipated park amenities include a children's junior / senior playground, soccer field, shade structure, seating, tables, walkways and associated landscaping.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide park amenities commensurate with rapid residential growth.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	0	675,000
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	67,500	0
Contingency %: 7	<u>4,725</u>	<u>47,250</u>
Sub Total:	<u>72,225</u>	<u>722,250</u>
HST Impact:	<u>1,271</u>	<u>12,712</u>
Total Project Cost:	<u><u>73,500</u></u>	<u><u>735,000</u></u>

**NOTES**

Construction funding to be requested in 2017.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	66,150	0	0	0	0	0	661,500
Non-DC Growth	7,350	0	0	0	0	0	73,500
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u><u>73,500</u></u>				<u><u>0</u></u>		<u><u>735,000</u></u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Berczy Beckett NW Park (Next to School) - Design

**DCA**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Amount in Study</u>
Parks-Berczy Beckett NW Parkette	2015	66,150	921,660
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<u>66,150</u>	<u>921,660</u>

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study:

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

The cost of design and construction exceeds what is included in the DC Study. Substitutions will be made in the DC forecast to accommodate this project cost. The remaining funds in the amount of \$848,130 will be used for park construction in 2017.

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$18,500
Quarter 2:	\$18,500
Quarter 3:	\$18,500
Quarter 4:	\$10,300
<b>Year 1 Total Cash Flow:</b>	<b>\$65,800</b>
Year 2:	\$7,700
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
<b>Total All Years:</b>	<b>\$73,500</b>

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Residential community is building out and park facilities need to be provided.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Residents will be underserved

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: **Berczy Beckett NW Parkette - Design**Project Cost: **\$23,500**Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: DesignUseful Life: 25Project Mgr: Linda IrvineCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐5 ☐ 6 ☒ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Category: MajorCost Validation: Internal peer reviewRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

To hire a landscape architect to provide full service landscape architectural services for this 0.54 ac / 0.22 ha parkette. Construction funding requested in 2016. Anticipated park amenities include a tot lot, trellis, seating, walkways and associated landscaping.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide park amenities commensurate with rapid residential development.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)****NOTES**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	0	225,000
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	21,600	0
Contingency %: 7	1,512	15,750
Sub Total:	23,112	240,750
HST Impact:	407	4,237
Total Project Cost:	23,500	245,000

Intention is for pre-approval of design in order to tender for construction in early 2016 and start construction in spring 2016.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	21,150	0	0	0	0	0	220,500
Operating Funded Non-Life Cycle	2,350	0	0	0	0	0	24,500
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<b>23,500</b>				<b>0</b>		<b>245,000</b>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Berczy Beckett NW Parkette - Design

**DCA**

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Year</u></b>	<b><u>Amount</u></b>	<b><u>Amount in Study</u></b>
Parks-Berczy Beckett NW Parkette	2015	21,150	921,660
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<u>21,150</u>	<u>921,660</u>

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study:

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

Remaining funds in the amount of \$898,170 to be used for park construction in 2017.

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$5,000
Quarter 2:	\$5,000
Quarter 3:	\$10,000
Quarter 4:	\$3,500

Year 1 Total Cash Flow: \$23,500

Year 2: \$0

Year 3 + beyond: \$0

Total All Years: \$23,500

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

The community is building out and park facilities need to be provided.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Residents will be underserved.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None.



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: **Box Grove Rizal Avenue Neighborhood Park - Design**Project Cost: **\$142,100**Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: DesignUseful Life: 25Project Mgr: Linda IrvineCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐  
5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☒ 8 ☐Category: MajorCost Validation: Recent awardsRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

To hire the landscape architect to provide full landscape architectural services for this 5.97 ac / 2.42 ha park (former surplus school site) on Rizal Avenue in Box Grove. Construction funding requested in 2016. Anticipated park amenities include a large gazebo, waterplay, junior/senior playground, soccer field, seating tables, walkways and associated landscaping.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide park amenities commensurate with rapid residential growth.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	0	1,260,000
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	130,500	0
Contingency %: 7	9,135	88,200
Sub Total:	139,635	1,348,200
HST Impact:	2,458	23,728
Total Project Cost:	<u>142,100</u>	<u>1,371,900</u>

**NOTES**

Land acquisition completed. Intention is for pre-approval of design in order to tender in spring 2016 and begin construction in summer of 2016.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	127,890	0	0	0	0	0	1,234,710
Non-DC Growth	14,210	0	0	0	0	0	137,190
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>142,100</u>				<u>0</u>		<u>1,371,900</u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Box Grove Rizal Avenue Neighborhood Park - Design

**DCA**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Amount in Study</u>	<u>Life Cycle</u>
Parks-Box Grove Rennie Ave NBHD Park	2016	127,890	1,267,769	Amount in Study: <input type="text"/>
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<u>127,890</u>	<u>1,267,769</u>	Amount Incl HST <input type="text"/>
				Year in the study <input type="text"/>

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

The cost of design and construction exceeds what is included in the DC Study. Substitutions will be made in the DC forecast to accommodate this additional project cost. Remaining funds in the amount of \$1,104,689 to be used for park construction in 2016.

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$0
Quarter 2:	\$50,000
Quarter 3:	\$50,000
Quarter 4:	\$42,100
<b>Year 1 Total Cash Flow:</b>	<b>\$142,100</b>
Year 2:	\$0
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
<b>Total All Years:</b>	<b>\$142,100</b>

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:   
RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Residential community is built out and park facilities need to be provided.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Residents will be underserved.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: **Cornell Madison Rouge Blvd. Park North - Design**Project Cost: **\$39,200**Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: DesignUseful Life: 25Project Mgr: Linda IrvineCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐5 ☒ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Category: MajorCost Validation: Recent awardsRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

To hire the landscape architect to provide full service landscape architectural services for this 1.21 ac / 0.49 ha park. Construction funding requested in 2016. Anticipated park amenities include a shade trellis, children's playground, seating, walkways, and associated landscaping.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide park amenities commensurate with rapid residential growth

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	0	360,000
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	36,000	0
Contingency %: 7	<u>2,520</u>	<u>25,200</u>
Sub Total:	<u>38,520</u>	<u>385,200</u>
HST Impact:	<u>678</u>	<u>6,780</u>
Total Project Cost:	<u><u>39,200</u></u>	<u><u>392,000</u></u>

**NOTES**

Intention is for preapproval of design in order to tender in early 2016 for a spring 2016 construction start.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	35,280	0	0	0	0	0	352,800
Operating Funded Non-Life Cycle	3,920	0	0	0	0	0	39,200
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u><u>39,200</u></u>				<u><u>0</u></u>		<u><u>392,000</u></u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Cornell Madison Rouge Blvd. Park North - Design

**DCA**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Amount in Study</u>
Parks-Cornell Madison Rouge Blvd. Park	2015	35,280	459,869
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<u>35,280</u>	<u>459,869</u>

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study:

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$10,000
Quarter 2:	\$10,000
Quarter 3:	\$10,000
Quarter 4:	\$9,200
<b>Year 1 Total Cash Flow:</b>	<b>\$39,200</b>
Year 2:	\$0
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
<b>Total All Years:</b>	<b>\$39,200</b>

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Residential community is built out and residents need park facilities.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Residents will be underserved.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None





## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Cornell Madison Rouge Blvd. Park South - DesignProject Cost: \$39,200Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: DesignUseful Life: 0Project Mgr: Linda IrvineCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐Category: Major5 ☒ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Cost Validation: Recent awardsRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

To hire a landscape architect to provide full service landscape architectural services for this 1.38 ac / 0.56 ha park next to the heritage house. Construction funding is requested in 2016. Anticipated park amenities include a children's playground, shade structure, seating, tables, walkways and associated landscaping.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide park amenities commensurate with rapid residential growth

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	0	360,000
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	36,000	0
Contingency %: 7	<u>2,520</u>	<u>25,200</u>
Sub Total:	<u>38,520</u>	<u>385,200</u>
HST Impact:	<u>678</u>	<u>6,780</u>
Total Project Cost:	<u><u>39,200</u></u>	<u><u>392,000</u></u>

**NOTES**

Intention is for preapproval of design in order to tender in early 2016 for a spring 2016 construction start.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	35,280	0	0	0	0	0	352,800
Operating Funded Non-Life Cycle	3,920	0	0	0	0	0	39,200
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u><u>39,200</u></u>				<u><u>0</u></u>		<u><u>392,000</u></u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Cornell Madison Rouge Blvd. Park South - Design

**DCA**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Amount in Study</u>	<u>Life Cycle</u>
Parks-Cornell Madison Rouge Blvd. Park S.	2015	35,280	524,281	Amount in Study: <input type="text"/>
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<u>35,280</u>	<u>524,281</u>	Amount Incl HST <input type="text"/>
				Year in the study <input type="text"/>

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1: \$10,000  
Quarter 2: \$10,000  
Quarter 3: \$10,000  
Quarter 4: \$9,200

Year 1 Total Cash Flow: \$39,200

Year 2: \$0

Year 3 + beyond: \$0

Total All Years: \$39,200

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Residential community is built out and park facilities are needed.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Residents will be underserved.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Leitchcroft Community Park Phase 2 - DesignProject Cost: \$114,700Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: DesignUseful Life: 25Project Mgr: Linda IrvineCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☒Category: MajorCost Validation: Internal peer reviewRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

This is to undertake the design of Phase 2 of Leitchcroft Community Park (2.19 ac / 0.89 ha). Anticipated elements include: parking lot, junior/senior children's playground, washroom building, walkways, seating and associated landscaping.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide park amenities commensurate with current and future residential growth in Leitchcroft.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)****NOTES**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	0	1,350,000
Internal Charges:	0	130,005
External Consulting:	105,300	0
Contingency %: 7	7,371	94,500
Sub Total:	<u>112,671</u>	<u>1,574,505</u>
HST Impact:	1,983	25,423
Total Project Cost:	<u>114,700</u>	<u>1,599,900</u>

Neighbouring business lands being converted to residential development which will drastically increase the population and need for park amenities. Intention is to expedite this project to begin construction in summer 2016.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	103,230	0	0	0	0	0	1,439,910
Operating Funded Non-Life Cycle	11,470	0	0	0	0	0	159,990
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>114,700</u>				<u>0</u>		<u>1,599,900</u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name: Leitchcroft Community Park Phase 2 - Design**

**DCA**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Amount in Study</u>
Parks-Leitchcroft Community Park Phase 2 (Western park addition)	2014	103,230	941,007
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<u>103,230</u>	<u>941,007</u>

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study:

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

Deficit to be addressed in next DC Study. Conversion of business lands to residential will provide significant increase in residential population additional DC funding applicable to new residential units.

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$0
Quarter 2:	\$20,000
Quarter 3:	\$20,000
Quarter 4:	\$74,700
<b>Year 1 Total Cash Flow:</b>	<b>\$114,700</b>
Year 2:	\$0
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
<b>Total All Years:</b>	<b>\$114,700</b>

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:   
RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Phase 1 of park is built and phase 2 needs to be built to complete the park and serve existing and future residents.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Residents will be underserved.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None.



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Main Street Milliken NW Parkette (Design and Construction)Project Cost: \$264,600Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2Department: DesignUseful Life: 25Project Mgr: Linda A. IrvineCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☒Category: MajorCost Validation: Recent awardsRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

This project is for the design and construction of a parkette (0.30 ac / 0.12 ha) at Pacific Villas in the Main Street Milliken area between Old Kennedy Road, Kennedy Road and Steeles Avenue. Anticipated park amenities include a children's playground, seating, walkways and associated landscaping.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Growth Management

To ensure that parks are built commensurate with rapid build out of surrounding community.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	225,000	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	18,000	0
Contingency %: 7	17,010	0
Sub Total:	260,010	0
HST Impact:	4,576	0
Total Project Cost:	264,600	0

**NOTES**

Intention is to expedite this project in order to start construction in the Spring of 2016

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	238,140	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operating Funded Non-Life Cycle	26,460	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>264,600</u>				<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Main Street Milliken NW Parkette (Design and Construction)

**DCA**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Amount in Study</u>
Parks-Main Street Milliken NW Parkette	2017	238,140	282,451
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<u>238,140</u>	<u>282,451</u>

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study:

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

Cost includes inflation from 2013.

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$20,000
Quarter 2:	\$100,000
Quarter 3:	\$100,000
Quarter 4:	\$44,600
<b>Year 1 Total Cash Flow:</b>	<b>\$264,600</b>
Year 2:	\$0
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
<b>Total All Years:</b>	<b>\$264,600</b>

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Residential development is built out and residents require recreation amenities.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Residents will be underserved.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Markham Centre Rouge Valley Drive West N. P. - DesignProject Cost: \$120,200Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: DesignUseful Life: 25Project Mgr: Linda IrvineCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☒ 4 ☐Category: Major5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Cost Validation: Internal peer reviewRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

This project is to design this 1.5 ha (3.7 ac) neighborhood park on Rouge Valley Drive West, north of Enterprise Blvd. Construction funding will be requested in 2017. Anticipated park amenities include a junior/senior play ground, tennis courts, gazebo, adult fitness, mini-skate spot, basketball court, mini soccer, seating and associated landscaping.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide park amenities commensurate with rapid residential growth

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)****NOTES**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	0	1,500,000
Internal Charges:	0	145,800
External Consulting:	112,500	0
Contingency %: 5	5,625	75,000
Sub Total:	118,125	1,720,800
HST Impact:	2,079	27,720
Total Project Cost:	<u>120,200</u>	<u>1,748,500</u>

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	108,180	0	0	0	0	0	1,573,650
Operating Funded Non-Life Cycle	12,020	0	0	0	0	0	174,850
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>120,200</u>				<u>0</u>		<u>1,748,500</u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Markham Centre Rouge Valley Drive West N. P. - Design

**DCA**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Amount in Study</u>
Parks-Remington Markham Centre Active Park East	2016	108,180	1,830,836
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<u>108,180</u>	<u>1,830,836</u>

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study:

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$0
Quarter 2:	\$40,000
Quarter 3:	\$50,000
Quarter 4:	\$30,200
<b>Year 1 Total Cash Flow:</b>	<b>\$120,200</b>
Year 2:	\$0
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
<b>Total All Years:</b>	<b>\$120,200</b>

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Residential community is built out and park facilities are needed

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Residents will be underserved.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None





## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Markham Village Library Square -Phase 1 ConstructionProject Cost: \$1,933,400Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: DesignUseful Life: 25Project Mgr: Linda IrvineCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☒Category: Major5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Cost Validation: Internal peer reviewRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

To hire the contractor to construct the first phase of this 5.18 ac / 2.1 ha project including the new War Memorial and Cenotaph. Matching funding of \$950,000 was received through the Canada 150 Community Infrastructure Program.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide park amenities commensurate with rapid and changing residential growth in intensification corridors.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	1,660,300	1,500,000
Internal Charges:	0	240,750
External Consulting:	98,959	0
Contingency %: 8	140,741	120,000
Sub Total:	1,900,000	1,860,750
HST Impact:	33,440	28,512
Total Project Cost:	<u>1,933,400</u>	<u>1,889,300</u>

**NOTES**

Funding of \$950,000 was received from Canada 150 Community Infrastructure Grant. This project serves new (growth related) as well as existing residents. Grant request: Soft costs \$110,000; Hard Costs \$1,690,000; and contingency \$100,000.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	885,060	0	0	0	0	0	1,700,370
Non-DC Growth	98,340	0	0	0	0	0	188,930
Other External	950,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	<u>1,933,400</u>				<u>0</u>		<u>1,889,300</u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Markham Village Library Square -Phase 1 Construction

**DCA**

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study
Parks-Land Development Not Identified in Study		0	
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		0	

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study:

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

Project to be included in next DC Background Study. 50% DCA and 50% Operating proposed to address use of space by new and existing residents.

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$20,000
Quarter 2:	\$50,000
Quarter 3:	\$500,000
Quarter 4:	\$500,000
<b>Year 1 Total Cash Flow:</b>	<b>\$1,070,000</b>
Year 2:	\$863,400
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
<b>Total All Years:</b>	<b>\$1,933,400</b>

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

**Estimated 2016 Deliverables**

Phase 1 of construction completed.

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

First phase of 3 phase project. Phase one consistent with Canada 150 Community Infrastructure Grant.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Canada 150 grant will be a risk.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Highway 404 Mid-block Crossing, North of Hwy 7: \$38.4 mProject Cost: \$929,800Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: EngineeringUseful Life: 0Project Mgr: Alice LamCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐5 ☐ 6 ☒ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Category: MajorCost Validation: Third party estimateRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

Highway 404 Mid-Block Crossing, North of Highway 7. Region of York will manage construction. Cost is to be shared with Region and Richmond Hill in accordance to the Tri-Party Agreement. This request is to cover the updated estimate of the City's portion of the total works for the project. This project will assist with the traffic issues on Highway 7 and Allstate Parkway and this road will provide an alternate East-West route across Hwy 404.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Transportation & Transit

Provide additional E/W link over Highway 404.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	700,000	0
Internal Charges:	75,000	0
External Consulting:	100,000	0
Contingency %: 5	40,000	0
Sub Total:	915,000	0
HST Impact:	14,784	0
Total Project Cost:	<u>929,800</u>	<u>0</u>

**NOTES**

Total cost of project (\$38.4 million). Markham, Richmond Hill and Region will be sharing equally the total cost of this project except for local components. Markham's share will be \$12.5 million which is approximately 1/3. Markham cost incurred: \$6.9 million. Remaining cost for Markham: \$5.6 million. Currently available in accounts: \$4.9 million (Account #10050, #12046, #14038, #15049). Total required: \$0.7 million. This includes: Properties, utility relocation, Street lighting, Roads, Stormwater, Landscaping, Structural, sidewalk works. Other costs include internal charges, external consulting and contingency. Maintenance of structural long term replacement (\$1 million) not included in this request. Engineering, Finance, Operations, Asset Management to meet.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		<u>Phases</u>
DCA	929,800	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>929,800</u>				<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Highway 404 Mid-block Crossing, North of Hwy 7: \$38.4 m

**DCA**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Amount in Study</u>	<u>Life Cycle</u>
Hard-Structures Hwy 404 Mid-Block Crossing - North of Hwy 7	2013	929,800	6,409,829	Amount in Study: <input type="text"/>
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<u>929,800</u>	<u>6,409,829</u>	Amount Incl HST <input type="text"/>
				Year in the study <input type="text"/>

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

100% DCA. This is to cover the remainder of the funding required for the City's share.

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$0
Quarter 2:	\$0
Quarter 3:	\$0
Quarter 4:	\$100,000
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	\$100,000
Year 2:	\$829,800
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
Total All Years:	\$929,800

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:   
RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

**Estimated 2016 Deliverables**

N/A - York Region Tendered work.

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Council has committed to project.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

N/A

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Highway 404 Ramp Extension, North of Hwy 7Project Cost: \$12,346,400Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: EngineeringUseful Life: 0Project Mgr: Alice LamCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

Category: MajorCW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐5 ☐ 6 ☒ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Cost Validation: Third party estimateRequirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

Construction of a fly over from Hwy. 7 (at the north exit ramp from Hwy. 404) to the extended Centurian Drive. This project will improve the traffic issues on Highway 7 and Allstate Parkway. Region of York will manage construction. Region proposes to undertake joint tender with Hwy 404 crossing this year.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Transportation & Transit

Direct connection for Highway 404 into business park which will reduce congestion on Hwy 7.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	10,500,000	0
Internal Charges:	700,000	0
External Consulting:	400,000	0
Contingency %: 5	545,000	0
Sub Total:	12,145,000	0
HST Impact:	201,432	0
Total Project Cost:	12,346,400	0

**NOTES**

The Region of York is scheduled to tender the ramp extension at the same time as the Hwy 404 mid block crossing (Fall 2015). The Region has proposed to complete the work and cover approximate 50% of the cost. Council report of Oct. 2013 recommended that project be deferred but the airport development may require this project. The scope of this project will include design, construction of the structure, streetscaping, roads, illumination, sidewalks, sewers, utility relocation and property. The region will manage the project and is currently entering into a MTO long term maintenance agreement for the structure. The total preliminary estimated cost from York Region is \$24 million. The City of Markham has not incurred any costs for this project as of this time.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<div>Components</div>								<u>Future Phases</u>
<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Budget</u>					<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	12,346,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>12,346,400</u>					<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Highway 404 Ramp Extension, North of Hwy 7

**DCA**

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Year</u></b>	<b><u>Amount</u></b>	<b><u>Amount in Study</u></b>	<b><u>Life Cycle</u></b>
Hard-Properties Hwy 404 Ramps - Hwy 7	2013	4,587,177	4,587,177	Amount in Study: <input type="text"/>
Hard-Structures Hwy 7 Ramp Improvements	2013	7,759,223	9,777,493	
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<u>#####</u>	<u>14,364,670</u>	Amount Incl HST <input type="text"/>
				Year in the study <input type="text"/>

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

100% DCA. This is to cover the remainder of the funding required for the City's share.

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$0
Quarter 2:	\$0
Quarter 3:	\$0
Quarter 4:	\$100,000
<b>Year 1 Total Cash Flow:</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>
Year 2:	\$12,246,400
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
<b>Total All Years:</b>	<b>\$12,346,400</b>

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

No Purchasing action required. York Region to tender.

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Region of York plans to tender this project with Mid Block Crossing. It is York Regions' initiative to pursue this ramp extension though it is not a priority of the City. The City's commitment depends on the outcome of the development at Buttonville.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Reduce Level of Service in Area.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Main Street Markham Hwy 407 to Hwy 7-Utility InstallationProject Cost: \$98,400Commission: Development ServicesRanking: 2 New Asset/ExpansionDepartment: EngineeringUseful Life: 0Project Mgr: Dan FoongCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☒Category: Minor5 ☒ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Cost Validation: Other(specify in Notes)Requirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

This project includes utility installation relating to road and bridge work on Main Street Markham from Highway 407 to Highway 7.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Transportation & Transit

Widening will assist in alleviating traffic issues in the City.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)****NOTES**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	59,894	0
Internal Charges:	9,000	0
External Consulting:	20,000	0
Contingency %: 10	7,989	0
Sub Total:	96,883	0
HST Impact:	1,547	0
Total Project Cost:	98,400	0

Installation for Rogers's work on Main Street Markham. Roger's quotation is \$120k as provided in letter dated July 7, 2015. Cost sharing as per Municipal Access Agreement: 50%. City of Markham cost: \$59,894 The cost sharing agreement covers Rogers construction costs only. The external consulting is for Markham's consultant to ensure that there are no conflict with proposed utility design with the proposed road design and is not a part of the cost sharing agreement.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>						<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>		
DCA	98,400	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>98,400</u>				<u>0</u>		<u>0</u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Main Street Markham Hwy 407 to Hwy 7-Utility Installation

**DCA** **Life Cycle**

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study
Hard-Roads Main St South, Markham Hwy 407 to Hwy 7	2013	98,400	3,341,730
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>		<u>98,400</u>	<u>3,341,730</u>

Amount in Study:

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$98,400
Quarter 2:	\$0
Quarter 3:	\$0
Quarter 4:	\$0
<b>Year 1 Total Cash Flow:</b>	<b>\$98,400</b>
Year 2:	\$0
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
<b>Total All Years:</b>	<b>\$98,400</b>

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

No procurement required.

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

Project is required as part of the Main Street Road reconstruction project.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

Existing utility infrastructure will remain throughout corridor.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A.





## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Culverts Rehabilitation (5 Structures) - Design & Const.Project Cost: \$1,430,900Commission: Community & Fire ServicesRanking: 1 Repair/ReplaceDepartment: Asset Mgmt - Right-of-way AssetsUseful Life: 25Project Mgr: Prathapan KumarCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☒ 3 ☒ 4 ☐  
5 ☒ 6 ☒ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Category: MajorCost Validation: Multiple(specify)Requirement Validation: Condition assessment**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

Design and construction for rehabilitation of 5 culverts: C023, C059, C197, C205 and C238.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Transportation & Transit

Effective structures rehabilitation program improves overall transportation accessibility, public safety, creates jobs through project implementation, recycle waste and supports City's vision for a sustainable community.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	1,167,146	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	239,054	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	1,406,200	0
HST Impact:	24,749	0
Total Project Cost:	1,430,900	0

**NOTES**

This project includes rehabilitation works for 5 culverts.

Cost Validation: Recent award and external reviews. Location: Refer to the attached map.

Design component requested as pre-approval.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>					<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Design + CA</u>	<u>Construction</u>				
Operating Funded Life Cycle	1,430,900	243,260	1,187,640	0	0	1,430,900	0
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>1,430,900</u>					<u>1,430,900</u>	<u>0</u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Culverts Rehabilitation (5 Structures) - Design & Const.

**DCA**

**Name**

**Year**

**Amount**

**Amount in  
Study**

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study: 1,430,900

Amount Incl HST 1,430,900

Year in the study 2016

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$25,000
Quarter 2:	\$25,000
Quarter 3:	\$25,000
Quarter 4:	\$20,000
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	\$95,000
Year 2:	\$1,335,900
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
Total All Years:	\$1,430,900

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing: 1/5/2016  
RFP/Tender Award by: 2/16/2016

Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/29/2017

**Estimated 2016 Deliverables**

100% completion of design works. Completion of design work is subject to TRCA /MNR approvals.

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class: Recurring Project – Maintain/Increase Service Level and no change in funding

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

2015 visual inspection indicated that rehabilitation is required for these structures to prevent further deterioration and to ensure public safety.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

All five structures need to be rehabilitated. If this is not carried out in a timely manner, then: (1) Structure will deteriorate faster; (2) Cost of rehabilitation will increase; and (3) Service life of structures will decrease

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None.



## 2019 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Pedestrian Bridge Rehab (7 Structures) - Design & Const.Project Cost: \$305,600Commission: Community & Fire ServicesRanking: 1 Repair/ReplaceDepartment: Asset Mgmt - Right-of-way AssetsUseful Life: 25Project Mgr: Prathapan KumarCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☒ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐  
5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Category: MajorCost Validation: Recent awardsRequirement Validation: Condition assessment**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

Design and construction for rehabilitation of 7 pedestrian bridges.

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Transportation & Transit

Effective structures rehabilitation program improves overall transportation accessibility, public safety, creates jobs through project implementation, recycle waste and supports City's vision for a sustainable community.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2019</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	300,300	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	300,300	0
HST Impact:	5,285	0
Total Project Cost:	305,600	0

**NOTES**

This project includes rehabilitation works for 7 pedestrian bridges P027, P028, P029, P030, P032, P033 and P034.

Cost Validation: Recent award and external reviews. Location: Refer to the attached map.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>					<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Design + CA</u>	<u>Construction</u>				
Operating Funded Life Cycle	305,600	0	305,600	0	0	305,600	0
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>305,600</u>					<u>305,600</u>	<u>0</u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Pedestrian Bridge Rehab (7 Structures) - Design & Const.

**DCA**

**Name**

**Year**

**Amount**

**Amount in  
Study**

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study:

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:

Quarter 2:

Quarter 3:

Quarter 4:

Year 1 Total Cash Flow:

Year 2: \$0

Year 3 + beyond: \$0

Total All Years:

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

2014/2015 visual inspection indicated that rehabilitation is required for these structures to prevent further deterioration and to ensure public safety.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

All 7 structures need to be rehabilitated. If this is not carried out in a timely manner, then: (1) Structure will deteriorate faster; (2) Cost of rehabilitation will increase; and (3) Service life of structures will decrease

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None.



## 2016 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number: Project Name: Retaining Wall Rehabilitation (B043) - Design & Const.Project Cost: \$209,600Commission: Community & Fire ServicesRanking: 1 Repair/ReplaceDepartment: Asset Mgmt - Right-of-way AssetsUseful Life: 75Project Mgr: Prathapan KumarCouncil Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☒

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☒ 4 ☐  
5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐Category: MajorCost Validation: Third party estimateRequirement Validation: Condition assessment**DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):**

Design and construction for rehabilitation of the retaining wall at Enterprise Blvd CNR Bridge (B043).

**BUILDING MARKHAM'S FUTURE TOGETHER: Describe how this project/initiative advances the objectives of BMFT.**Primary Objective: Transportation & Transit

Effective structures rehabilitation program improves overall transportation accessibility, public safety, creates jobs through project implementation, recycle waste and supports City's vision for a sustainable community.

**PROJECT COSTS (\$)**

	<u>2016</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
Cost/Quote:	171,000	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	35,000	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	206,000	0
HST Impact:	3,626	0
Total Project Cost:	209,600	0

**NOTES**

This project includes rehabilitation works for the retaining wall at Enterprise Blvd CNR Bridge (B043). This retaining wall was constructed in 2005 along with the bridge.  
Bridge condition inspection and rehabilitation is the responsibility of GO Transit and the City is responsible for retaining wall inspection and rehabilitation.  
Cost Validation: External reviews.  
Location: Refer to the attached map.  
Design component requested as pre-approval.

**PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING (\$)**

<u>Funding Type</u>	<u>Components</u>					<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Future Phases</u>
	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Design + CA</u>	<u>Construction</u>				
Operating Funded Life Cycle	209,600	35,600	174,000	0	0	209,600	0
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<u>209,600</u>					<u>209,600</u>	<u>0</u>

**OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT**

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Non Personnel</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures/(Revenues)</u>
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**Project Name:** Retaining Wall Rehabilitation (B043) - Design & Const.

**DCA**

**Name**

**Year**

**Amount**

**Amount in  
Study**

**Life Cycle**

Amount in Study:

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study

DCA and/or Life Cycle: Explain if there is a change in the year and/or an increase/decrease in cost

**Cash Flow Estimates:**

Quarter 1:	\$10,000
Quarter 2:	\$25,000
Quarter 3:	\$62,300
Quarter 4:	\$62,300
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	\$159,600
Year 2:	\$50,000
Year 3 + beyond:	\$0
Total All Years:	\$209,600

**Procurement Plan:**

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:   
RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2016 Deliverables

**Business Case - Rationale for project submission**

i) Project Class:

ii) What is the rationale for this project? Comment on Service Level.

2015 visual inspection indicated that ground water is seeping through the joints in the retaining wall in the vicinity of the pumping station at several locations. Leakage during winter has been severe enough to cause freezing ice hazards to traffic using Enterprise Blvd. Water seepage needs to be controlled to prevent deterioration to the retaining wall and to ensure public safety.

iii) What are the implications of this project not being approved?

The retaining wall needs to be rehabilitated. If this is not carried out in a timely manner, then: (1) Structure will deteriorate faster; (2) Cost of rehabilitation will increase; and (3) Service life of structures will decrease

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None.