



Report to: General Committee

Report Date: February 2, 2015

SUBJECT: Staff Awarded Contracts for the Month of January 2015

PREPARED BY: Alex Moore, Ext. 4711

RECOMMENDATION:

1. THAT the report entitled “Staff Awarded Contracts for the Month of January 2015” be received;
2. And that Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution

PURPOSE:

To inform Council of Staff Awarded Contracts >\$50,000 for the month of January 2015 as per Purchasing By-law 2004-341.

BACKGROUND:

Council at its meeting of May 26th, 2009 amended By-Law 2004-341, A By-Law Establishing Procurement, Service and Disposal Regulations and Policies. The Purchasing By-Law delegates authority to staff to award contracts without limits if the award meets the following criteria:

- The award is to the lowest priced bidder
- The expenses relating to the goods / services being procured is included in the approved budget (Operating/Capital)
- The award of the contract is within the approved budget
- The award results from the normal tendering process of the City (i.e. open bidding through advertisements that meet transparency and enables open participation)
- The award is to the lowest priced bidder
- The term of the contract is for a maximum of 4 years
- There is no litigation between the successful bidder and the City at the time of award
- There are no bidder protests at the time of contract award

If one (1) of the above noted criteria is not met then any contract award >\$350,000 requires Council approval.

Where the contract being awarded is a Request for Proposal (RFP) the approval authority limits of staff is up to \$350,000.

Community & Fire Services

Award Details	Description
Lowest Priced Supplier	• 247-Q-14 Remove and Replace Retaining Walls • 261-T-14 Clatworthy Rinkboards and Glass Replacement
Highest Ranked / Lowest Priced Supplier	• 237-R-14 Consulting Engineering Services for Underground Streetlight Cable Condition Inspection (2015)
Highest Ranked / Second Lowest Priced Supplier	• 053-R-12 Supply and Delivery of the Fire Department’s Bunker Gear Requirements Contract Extension

Development Services

Award Details	Description
Highest Ranked / Lowest Priced Supplier	• 143-R-14 Consulting Services for the Detailed Design of Intersection improvements including Feasibility Studies

13/02/2015

X 

Joel Lustig
Treasurer

13/02/2015

X 

Trinela Cane
Commissioner, Corporate Services



STAFF AWARD REPORT

Page 1 of 2

To:	Brenda Librecz, Commissioner, Community & Fire Services
Re:	247-Q-14 Remove and Replace Retaining Walls
Date:	January 14, 2015
Prepared by:	John Hoover, Supervisor, Contract Administration, ext. 4808 Patti Malone, Senior Buyer, ext. 2239

PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for the removal and replacement of retaining wall at Robinson St south of Homestead.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	CSL Group Ltd. (Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 38,532.13	a/c # 050-6150-13458-005
Less cost of award	\$ 59,885.76	Inclusive of HST
Budget Shortfall after this award	\$ (21,353.63)	*

*Budget shortfall will be funded from the Non-DC capital contingency.

BACKGROUND

The City issued a bid to the market for the removal and installation (approximately 122 metres x 1.2 metres) of existing retaining wall at Robinson St south of Homestead.

The retaining wall currently incorporates a small stairway down to the sidewalk, just north of the fire hydrant. This stairway is not required to be reinstated. Restoration including backfill, nursery grade soil and sod applied to all affected areas of construction.

This location has exceeded its life cycle of 20 years and the condition assessment confirmed that the retaining wall requires replacement.

OPTION/DISCUSSIONS

In 2013, Sheffield Contracting was awarded the contract for the removal and installation at the Robinson St south of Homestead. The contract amount was \$38,532.13 inclusive of HST and the funding for this work was included in capital project #13458 (total project amount of \$72,700 inclusive of HST for work at four (4) locations).

Due to communication issues with Sheffield Contracting and their unwillingness to commence the work, the City terminated the contract and disqualified Sheffield Contracting for period of two (2) years from any future City opportunities. Due to the above, the City reissued a quotation for this work.

BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN
Bids closed on	December 17 th , 2014
Number picking up bid documents	66
Number responding to bid	19

DETAILED PRICING INFORMATION (Inclusive of HST)

Suppliers	Bid Price
CSL Group Ltd.	\$59,885.76
2274084 Ontario Ltd. o/a GMP Contracting Ltd.	\$62,570.19
Verticqal Horizons Contracting Inc.	\$65,446.47
All Services Incorporated	\$67,039.49
Titanium Contracting Inc.	\$71,840.52
Euro Landscape Construction	\$73,018.54
Speedside Construction Limited	\$74,386.56
MPS Ltd. Markham Property Services	\$77,480.06
Tri-capital Construction Inc.	\$78,151.68
Nafees Enterprises Inc.	\$78,355.20
Anthony Furlano Construction Inc.	\$81,408.00
Hawkins Contracting Services Limited	\$82,018.56
Con Group Limited	\$84,460.80
National Structures Inc.	\$85,474.33
Signature Contractors Windsor Inc.	\$87,288.47
H.N. Construction Ltd.	\$96,875.52
Rutherford Contracting Ltd.	\$109,756.65
Bowie Contracting Ltd.	\$119,654.50
Trisan Construction	\$122,112.00
Civil Underground & Excavation Co. Ltd.	\$134,882.88
Construction and Project Management	\$162,816.00

The work will commence following contract award and will be completed by June 30, 2015.

Note: Staff believe Sheffield Contracting underbid the project in 2013 and the recommended award price under this contract is more accurate.



STAFF AWARD REPORT

To:	Brenda Librecz, Commissioner, Community & Fire Services
Re:	261-T-14 Clatworthy Rinkboards and Glass Replacement
Date:	January 22, 2015
Prepared by:	Robert Hartnett, Facility Coordinator – West Thornhill Community Centre, Ext. 3788 Rosemarie Patano, Senior Construction Buyer, Ext. 2990

PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for Clatworthy Rinkboards and Glass Replacement

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	Welmar Recreational Products Inc. (Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current budget available	\$ 223,429.68	070-6150-15156-005 Clatworthy Rinkboard and Glass Replacement
Less cost of award	\$ 177,652.61 \$ 19,761.79 <u>\$ 17,652.26</u> \$ 215,066.66	Base Award Provisional Items Contingency (10%) Total Cost of Award (Inclusive of HST)
Budget Remaining after this award	\$ 8,363.02	*

* The remaining balance in the amount of \$8,363.02 will be returned to the original funding source.

BACKGROUND

At the Clatworthy Community Centre, the existing rinkboard structure is 33-years old and the framing is primarily constructed of wood. The wood is deteriorated and has become structurally weak. A failure of the board system would close the facility until temporary repairs can be carried out. The new board system is constructed of aluminum and has a significantly longer life cycle and will increase participant safety due to board give. This project includes the necessary accessibility upgrades at Clatworthy Arena, which is regularly used for sledge hockey. Accessibility upgrades include clear panel boards at the gates, flush accessibility on the ice surface, wide gate and sledge friendly flooring.

Other alternatives such as a wood or a steel galvanized system were considered. However, both alternates were deemed unsatisfactory due to either lifecycle (board wood rot) or safety concerns (rigidness and inflexibility of the structure).

BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN
Bid closed on	January 15, 2015
Number picking up document	7
Number responding to bid	4

PRICE SUMMARY

Suppliers	Bid Price *	Provisional Prices	Total
Welmar Recreational Products Inc.	\$177,652.61	\$19,761.79	\$197,414.40
Riley Manufacturing	\$185,304.96	\$21,593.47	\$206,898.43
1466147 Ont Inc. (O/A Sound Barriers)	\$209,218.56	\$23,984.83	\$233,203.39
Sport Systems Unlimited Corp. (dba Athletica Sport Systems)	\$246,752.74	\$17,531.21	\$264,283.95

*The bid price (Bid opening) excluding provisional items.

Note: The provisional items include: additional board kits for the dashboard; removal of existing and installation of powered sliding door to heated arena viewing area; and, new door openers and push button operators for dressing rooms. These items were left out of tender due to uncertainty of tender prices the City would receive and Staff believes they are good value to include within this award. The project is expected to commence April 2015 and be complete before May 2015.



STAFF AWARD REPORT

Page 1 of 2

To:	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer
Re:	237-R-14 Consulting Engineering Services for Underground Streetlight Cable Condition Inspection (2015)
Date:	January 22, 2015
Prepared by:	Shipra Singh, Senior Asset Coordinator, Asset Management ext. 2747 Tony Casale, Senior Construction Buyer Ext: 3190

PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for consulting engineering services to carry out underground streetlight cable condition inspections.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	Metsco Energy Solutions Inc. (Highest Ranked/Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 175,600.00	750-101-5699-15276 Streetlight Underground Cable – Condition Inspection
Less cost of award	\$ 148,060.80 <u>\$ 14,806.08</u> \$ 162,866.88	Cost of Award (Inclusive of HST and Disbursements) Contingency (10%) Total Cost of Award
Budget Remaining	\$ 12,733.12	*

* The remaining budget of \$12,733.12 will be returned to the original funding source.

BACKGROUND

As the City's infrastructure ages, it is necessary to carry out condition inspection of assets in order to predict the future maintenance costs and provide reliable life cycle costing. In order to achieve this effectively, the City investigates the condition of underground streetlight cables within the older areas of the City. The service life of underground cable is estimated to be 40 years. The consultant retained for this project will carry out condition inspection/assessments on 120 km of underground streetlight cable.

BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN (Electronic Tendering Network)
Bids closed on	December 4, 2014
Number picking up bid document	5*
Number responding to bid	2

* Purchasing contacted all bidders that picked up the Bid document but did not submit a bid. The one bidder advised they did not submit a bid as they were unable to meet all the project requirements.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The Evaluation Team was comprised of staff from the Asset Management department and facilitated by staff from the Purchasing department. Due to the complexity of the project, staff wanted to ensure that bidders had the necessary qualifications and experience to carry out the work and as such, the City released this RFP utilizing a two-stage, two-envelope system.

Stage One (1) – Technical Evaluation:

Under Stage 1 – Technical Evaluation (Envelope 'A'), Bidders were assessed against pre-determined criteria as outlined in the RFP; Experience / Past Performance of the consulting firm 15%, Qualifications and Experience of the Project Manager and Project Team 20% and Project Delivery 35% totaling 70%. Bidders were required to score a minimum technical score of 56 out of 70 points to proceed to Stage 2 – Price Evaluation. In the event that fewer than two bidders scored a minimum technical score of 56 points then the City had the option to either advance to Stage 2 all bidders that obtained a technical evaluation of 52.5 points or higher or cancel the Request for Proposal process.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION (Continued)**Stage Two (2) – Price Evaluation:**

The City received two Bids in response to this Request for Proposal of which only one met the 56 point threshold. As such, the decision made was to advance both bidders that obtained a technical evaluation of 52.5 points or higher as outlined in the Bid document. The highest ranked bidder was determined by adding the points awarded under Stage 1 – Technical Evaluation and Stage 2 – Price Evaluation.

Suppliers	Stage 1 Technical (70 points)	Stage 2 Price (30 points)	Total Score (100 points)	Overall Ranking
Metsco Energy Solutions Inc.	63.45	30.00	93.45	1
Bold Engineering Inc.	52.80	16.20	69.00	2

Price submissions ranged from \$148,060.80 to \$216,178.94 (Inclusive of HST). As compared to 2013 pricing, this contract represents a price reduction of approximately 3.4%.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS (Incl. of HST)

Account Name	Account #	Budget Available	Amount to be allocated for this Work	Contingency (10%)	Total Cost	Budget Remaining
Streetlight Underground Cable – Condition Inspection (2015)	750-101-5699- 15276	\$ 175,600.00	\$ 148,060.80	\$14,806.08	\$162,866.88	\$12,733.12
Total		\$ 175,600.00	\$ 148,060.80	\$14,806.08	\$162,866.88	\$12,733.12

*The remaining budget of \$12,733.12 will be returned to the original funding source.

The recommended consultant, METSCO Energy Solutions Inc. has strong experience in conducting streetlight cable inspection services. They were highest ranked/lowest priced bidder on the previous contract for streetlight cable inspection services and their performance was satisfactory. Their proposal demonstrated to the City's satisfaction that they have the experience to undertake the project and they have a strong understanding of the project deliverables, key issues and challenges resulting in an overall higher ranking.



STAFF AWARD REPORT

Page 1 of 2

To:	Andy Taylor, chief Administrative Officer
Re:	053-R-12 Supply and Delivery of the Fire Department's Bunker Gear Requirements – Contract Extension
Date:	December 4, 2014
Prepared by:	Philip Alexander, Deputy Fire Chief Support Services Ext. 5960 Patti Malone, Senior Buyer Ext. 2239

PURPOSE

To obtain approval to extend the contract for supply and delivery of Fire Department's bunker gear requirements for 2 additional years, 2015 and 2016 as per the original document submission.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	Safedesign Apparel Ltd. (Highest Ranked / 2 nd Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 352,192.00	See 'Financial Considerations'
Less cost of award	\$ 148,084.44	Year 4 – 2015 (inclusive of HST)*
	\$ 27,765.83	Year 5 – 2016 (inclusive of HST)*
	\$ 175,850.27	
Budget Remaining after this award	\$ 204,107.56	**(\$352,192 - \$148,084.44)

*Subject to Council approval of the 2015 and 2016 Capital Budget.

** Remaining funds will be used for future bunker gear replacement based on condition assessment and other considerations, and for replacement of equipment due to staff retirements as budgeted for in these approved accounts.

BACKGROUND

Bunker gear suits are designed for firefighters with materials that protect the upper and lower body, excluding head, hands, and feet, during fire fighting. It is mandatory that all materials and construction must meet or exceed National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard #1971 (current edition) and/or Occupational Safety and Health Association (OSHA29) CFR 1910.156, latest interpretation. These suits are tested by a third party agency on a yearly basis.

The award is to provide bunker gear for 67 suits that are scheduled for life cycle replacement based on condition assessments (52 in 2015 and 15 in 2016) and to provide for new gear for any staff retirements and potentially for any other new staff approved by Council during this two year period.

OPTIONS/DISCUSSIONS

In 2012, Staff awarded the contract for supply and delivery of Fire Department's bunker gear requirements (053-R-12) to the highest ranked bidder / 2nd Lowest Priced Bidder (Safedesign Apparel Ltd.) for a 3-year term (2012/2013/2014). The bid document and submission had an option to renew for 2 additional years (2015/2016), with an price increase of 5% and at the same terms, conditions, and subject to contractor's performance and satisfaction of the City.

Under this report, Staff are requesting approval to exercise the option to renew in the original contract and extend the contract for an additional 2 years with a price increase of 5%.

Quality

While wear and tear on firefighting garments is not entirely predictable, manufacturers estimate that bunker gear has a typical life expectancy of 5 years. To date Fire staff has received far greater wear from Safedesign Apparel Ltd. (Safedesign) suits than the typical life expectancy. On average the City have received roughly 6.5 to 7 years service life from these suits and it is anticipated the proposed garments will continue to provide the same performance. The Lifecycle Reserve Study has already been adjusted to reflect bunker gear to a 7 year lifespan.

OPTIONS/DISCUSSIONS (Continued)

Price

Safedesign bid submission in 2012 included a 5% increase on the price summary sheet for Year 4 & 5 of the contract, the first 3 years of contract pricing were at the same itemized pricing. Staff tried to re-negotiate the 5% increase; however, Safedesign identified an increase in cost to manufacture and the largest cost factor for this increase being the Canadian Dollar. When the contract was awarded in 2012, the Canadian dollar was trading at par with the US dollar, whereas, today the Canadian dollar is trading at 88.66 cents US. It is also predicted that the Canadian dollar could see a further drop.

The Globe GXTREME fire suits for Markham are manufactured in New Hampshire and the primary fabric supplier for Nomex and Kevlar is Dupont, who increase their prices not just annually but periodically during the year. Dupont will be increasing their fibre prices to the fabric manufactures by double digits through 2015. The projected cost increase for fabrics for 2015 is 4.5%.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Account	Account #	Budget	Budget Available	Allocation of Award*	Budget Remaining
Bunker Gear Life Cycle Replacement 2012	067-6150-12180-005	\$ 115,800	\$ 58,592	\$ 58,592	\$ -
Bunker Gear Life Cycle Replacement 2015	067-6150-15XXX-005	\$ 93,000	\$ 93,000	\$ 33,079	\$ 59,921
Replacement of Equipment due to Staff Retirements 2015	067-6150-15XXX-005	\$ 76,300	\$ 76,300	\$ 21,155	\$ 55,145
2015 Firefighter Equipment for Cornell 2 nd Crew	067-5350-15010-005	\$ 124,300	\$ 124,300	\$ 35,258	\$ 89,042
Total		\$ 409,400	\$ 352,192	\$ 148,084	\$ 204,108



STAFF AWARD REPORT

Page 1 of 5

To:	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer
Re:	143-R-14 Consulting Services for the Detailed Design of Intersection improvements including Feasibility Studies
Date:	January 12, 2014
Prepared by:	Andrew Crickmay, Capital Works Engineer, Ext: 2065 Tony Casale, Senior Construction Buyer Ext. 2990

PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for consulting services for the detailed design of intersection improvements including feasibility studies.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	Chisholm, Fleming and Associates (Highest Ranked / Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 316,180.34	083-6150-14043-005 Intersection Improvement
Less cost of award	\$ 126,538.80	Cost of Award (Incl. of HST)
	\$ 12,653.88	Contingency @ 10%
	\$ 139,192.68	Total (Incl. of HST)
	\$ 12,527.34	Internal Management Fee @ 9%
	\$ 151,720.02	Total Cost of Award (Inclusive of HST)
Budget Remaining after this award	\$ 164,460.32	*

*The remaining budget will be returned to the original funding source and the 2015 capital budget (15052 Intersection Improvements) will be used for the reconstruction of Victoria Park Avenue and Steelcase Road East.

BACKGROUND

As part of the City's ongoing intersection improvements program, the City of Markham is proceeding with geometric improvements at the following three (3) intersections. The consultant will be required to complete detailed design drawings and tender documents for the construction of left turn lanes at Victoria Park Avenue / Steelcase Road East; and complete two (2) engineering feasibility studies for the intersections of Apple Creek Boulevard / McIntosh Drive, and Robinson Drive / George Street / Joseph Street / Washington Street. Operations staff has confirmed that the following intersections require improvements.

Victoria Park Avenue / Steelcase Road East

The intersection of Victoria Park Avenue / Steelcase Road East is operating over capacity during the P.M. period. This is due to delays associated with northbound and southbound left turns on Victoria Park Avenue as suggested by Operations. Left turn lanes on Victoria Park Avenue will segregate left turn movements from through traffic, thereby improving overall intersection operations. Victoria Park Avenue is currently a two lane roadway with an urban cross section. Steelcase Road East is currently a two lane roadway with an urban cross section and left turn lanes in both directions.

The consultant will be required to complete preliminary and detailed design drawings and tender documents for the construction of northbound and southbound left turn lanes. Consultant services include traffic engineering analysis and studies; traffic signal timing; geometric design; grading and drainage plans; storm and sanitary sewers; water servicing, illumination, streetscape design; geotechnical analysis (bore holes and pavement structure design); retaining wall design; relocation of utilities, if required; requirements for temporary and permanent easements, and preparation of property plans and right-of-way requirements for both acquisitions and easements; recommendations for removal and replacement of aged servicing infrastructure within project limits; construction staging and pedestrian detour/diversion plans.

BACKGROUND (Continued)

As part of the design work, the consultant will be required to meet with applicable reviewing agencies, complete all applications, and obtain all required permits and approvals.

The subject intersection is illustrated in **Attachment A**.

The intersection of Apple Creek Boulevard and McIntosh Drive currently exhibits driver sightline issues due to the vertical curve on Apple Creek Boulevard. The future Highway 404 mid-block crossing and the Centurian Drive widening will contribute to increased traffic volumes along intermediate collector routes, including Apple Creek Boulevard and McIntosh Drive. The feasibility of future intersection improvements to address driver sightline distances, vehicle and pedestrian safety, and increase traffic volumes and turning movements need to be evaluated. The feasibility study will be conducted to assess possible intersection improvements to alleviate these concerns.

The consultant will investigate alternative concepts including lowering the crest on Apple Creek Boulevard (increasing the vertical curvature to provide for greater sightline distance); introducing exclusive turning lanes; intersection signalization; and right-in-right-out (access restrictions). Some of the key issues that will become inherent in the development of the feasibility study include potential impacts to surrounding properties; preliminary investigations into grading, drainage, and retaining walls; driveway grades and access to surrounding properties; impacts to existing utilities; and future property acquisition including temporary and permanent easements.

The subject intersection is illustrated in **Attachment B**.

Robinson Drive / George Street / Joseph Street / Washington Street

The intersection of Robinson Drive / George Street / Joseph Street / Washington Street exhibit non-standard geometry with navigational and safety issues. Future enhancements need to be considered in order to improve intersection operations. The feasibility of a roundabout is being considered as a possible option due to the confluence of five (5) road segments and the available lands surrounding the intersection.

The consultant will investigate alternative intersection concepts including various reconfigurations as a multi-pronged intersection. Pre-engineering activities will consist of legal and topographic surveys and subsurface utility investigations. Some of the key issues that will be considered as part of the feasibility study include maximizing available public space (boulevards); minimizing impact to adjacent private properties; preliminary investigation of road geometry; grading, drainage, and storm-water management; impact to existing utilities; and future property acquisition including temporary and permanent easements

The subject intersection is illustrated in **Attachment C**.

It is anticipated that the detailed design and feasibility studies will commence in January 2015 and be completed by April 2015.

BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN (Electronic Tendering Network)
Bids closed on	September 4, 2014
Number picking up bid documents	14*
Number responding to bid	3

*Of the bidders contacted by Purchasing that picked up the Bid document but did not submit a Bid; three bidders did not bid due to current workload and another bidder was interested in bidding as a sub consultant only.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The Evaluation Team was comprised of staff from the Engineering Department and facilitated by staff from the Purchasing Department. The proposals were evaluated based on pre-established evaluation criteria as listed in the RFP document: Qualifications and Experience of the Consulting firm (20%), Qualification and Experience of the Lead Consultant and Project Team (20%), Project Methodology, Schedule and Work Plan (30%) and price (30%), totaling 100%.

Suppliers	Technical (70 points)	Price (30 points)	Total Score (100 points)	Overall Ranking
Chisholm, Fleming and Associates	50.00	30.00	80.00	1
Stantec Consulting Ltd.	67.00	0.00	67.00	2
Ainley and Associates Ltd.	51.00	0.00	51.00	3

Note: Bid prices ranged from to \$126,538 to \$350,677 (Incl. of HST).

Staff is recommending awarding the contract to the highest ranked and lowest priced consultant Chisholm, Fleming and Associates as their proposal best met the project requirements. The firm has extensive experience with similar projects, including recent design and construction administration services for intersection improvements in the City of Markham.

The project team is comprised of experienced staff, most having over 15 years of experience. The lead project manager has 16 years of experience and has been involved and managed a wide range of municipal projects such as arterial and local road improvements, road urbanization, watermain and sewer replacement projects, environmental assessments, and construction management. Their proposal conveyed a good understanding of the project including design requirements, key issues, and constraints.

Prices from the two other consultants were 100% and 177% higher than the price from Chisholm, Fleming & Associates (approximately \$124,000 and \$220,000 higher, respectively). Staff is of the opinion that the number of hours dedicated by Chisholm, Fleming & Associates is a reasonable commitment to meet the project deliverables.

The technical evaluation was based on details provided on items such as: existing site conditions, project requirements, key tasks, issues / constraints, critical task milestones, staff and experience.

ATTACHMENT A – Victoria Park Avenue / Steelcase Road East



ATTACHMENT B – Apple Creek Boulevard / McIntosh Road



ATTACHMENT C – Robinson Drive / George Street / Joseph Street / Washington Street

