CITY OF MARKHAM
2015 CAPITAL and OTHER PROGRAMS PRE-APPROVAL BUDGET
by Department

Project Description	Criteria Ref.	Total	Operating Non-Life Cycle	Operating Life Cycle	DC - Reserve	DC - Developer	Other	Description of Other Funding
Development Services								
Design								
Berczy Square Park, Upper Unionville - Design and Construction	2	673,200	67,320		605,880			
TOTAL Design		**673,200**	**67,320**	-	**605,880**	-	-	
Engineering								
Downstream Improvement Work SWM Strategy	1	533,100		186,585	346,515			
Engineering Studies	3	100,000			100,000			(1) See notes below
Highway 7 Streetscaping	2	324,600			324,600			
Highway 7 Watermain	2	534,800					534,800	Waterworks Reserve
Markham Centre - Parking Business Plan	3	185,900			185,900			
Markham Centre MESP Consolidation	3	557,700			557,700			
Markham Centre Transportation Study	3	247,900			247,900			
Miller Avenue - Woodbine Avenue to Rodick (Property)	2	176,700			176,700			
Transportation Demand Management Studies	3	38,100			38,100			
TOTAL Engineering		**2,698,800**	-	**186,585**	**1,977,415**	-	**534,800**	
TOTAL Development Services		**3,372,000**	**67,320**	**186,585**	**2,583,295**	-	**534,800**	
Community & Fire Services								
Museum								
Museum Annual Building Maintenance Program	3	35,000		35,000				(2) See notes below
TOTAL Museum		**35,000**	-	**35,000**	-	-	-	
Recreation Services								
Clatworthy Arena Rinkboard & Glass Replacement	3	230,800		230,800				
TOTAL Recreation Services		**230,800**	-	**230,800**	-	-	-	
Operations - Roads								
Boulevard Repairs	3	51,800		51,800				
Bridge Structure Preventative Maintenance	3	46,500		46,500				
Emergency Repairs	3	103,500		103,500				
Localized Repairs - Curb & Sidewalk	3	535,700		535,700				
Parking Lots - Localized Repairs	3	103,500		103,500				
Parking Lots- Rehabilitation	3	38,200		38,200				
Railway Crossing Improvements	3	50,400		50,400				
Secondary Roadworks	3	289,500					289,500	Roads Reserve
TOTAL Operations - Roads		**1,219,100**	-	**929,600**	-	-	**289,500**	
Operations - Parks								
Paving Pathways/Facilities & Stairways Repairs	3	123,900		123,900				(3) See notes below
Playstructure & Rubberized Safety Surface Replacement	3	62,000		62,000				(4) See notes below
Sportsfield Maintenance & Reconstruction	3	120,000		120,000				
TOTAL Operations - Parks		**305,900**	-	**305,900**	-	-	-	
Operations - Traffic								

CITY OF MARKHAM
2015 CAPITAL and OTHER PROGRAMS PRE-APPROVAL BUDGET
by Department

Project Description	Criteria Ref.	Total	Operating Non-Life Cycle	Operating Life Cycle	DC - Reserve	DC - Developer	Other	Description of Other Funding
Traffic Control Signal Design & Construction	2	25,500			25,500			(5) See notes below
TOTAL Operations - Traffic		**25,500**	-	-	**25,500**	-	-	
Operations - Fleet								
Corporate Fleet Refurbishing	3	36,100		36,100				
TOTAL Operations - Fleet		**36,100**	-	**36,100**	-	-	-	
Asset Mgmt - Facility Assets								
Roofing Replacement Projects	3	1,152,900		1,152,900				
TOTAL Asset Mgmt - Facility Assets		**1,152,900**	-	**1,152,900**	-	-	-	
Asset Mgmt -Environmental Assets								
Erosion Restoration- 110/130 Denison Street (Construction)	2	200,000		71,200	128,800			
TOTAL Asset Mgmt - Environmental Assets		**200,000**	-	**71,200**	**128,800**	-	-	
Asset Mgmt - Right-of-way Assets								
Bridges and Culverts - Condition Inspection	1	63,200		63,200				
Former Sabiston Landfill - Monitoring	3	156,500		156,500				
Streetlight Underground Cable - Condition Inspection	3	175,600		175,600				
Structures Rehabilitation (4 Structures) - Design & Const.	2	91,600		91,600				(6) See notes below
TOTAL Asset Mgmt - Right-of-Way Assets		**486,900**	-	**486,900**	-	-	-	
Waterworks								
Carlton Road Pumping Station Upgrade	1	908,000					908,000	Waterworks Reserve
Water Meter Replacement/Upgrade Program	3	555,300					555,300	Waterworks Reserve
TOTAL Waterworks		**1,463,300**	-	-	-	-	**1,463,300**	
TOTAL Community & Fire Services		**5,155,500**	-	**3,248,400**	**154,300**	-	**1,752,800**	
TOTAL Pre-Approval Requests		**8,527,500**	**67,320**	**3,434,985**	**2,737,595**	-	**2,287,600**	

Notes:

(1) The overall project budget is $619,700, pre-approval request is for $100,000 for the 1 study only

(2) The overall project budget is $165,500, pre-approval request is for $35,000 for Mount Joy only

(3) The overall project budget is $326,900, pre-approval request is for $123,900 for the paving contract portion only

(4) The overall project budget is $939,900, pre-approval request is for $62,000 for 1 location only

(5) The overall project budget is $408,000, pre-approval request is for $25,500 for the design portion only

(6) The overall project budget is $412,000, pre-approval request is for $91,600 for the design portion only

Appendix 2

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Name: **Berczy Square Park - Design & Construction**

Project Cost: **$673,200**

Commission: Development Services

Department: Design

Project Mgr: Linda Irvine

Ward(s): CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☑ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Ranking: 1 New Asset/Expansion

Useful Life: 25

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Category: Major

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

To fund the design and construction of "Berczy Square Park" in Upper Unionville. This park is 0.323 ac / 0.131 ha and is adjacent to the SWM Pond, and live/work precinct. It will contain a commemorative statue of William Berczy (a $300,000 public art contribution by the developer) as well as other park features such as shade structures, seating, landscaping, and a public plaza.

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

Primary Objective: Growth Management

To ensure that parks are delivered commenserate with the build-out of the adjacent neighborhood.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	468,000	0
Internal Charges:	54,698	0
External Consulting:	100,000	0
Contingency %: 7	39,760	0
Sub Total:	662,458	0
HST Impact:	10,697	0
Total Project Cost:	**673,200**	**0**

NOTES

External Consulting costs include all prime and sub-consultants as required to complete this project. Construction tender in Jan/Feb, award in March, and construction start in May 2015. This project does not include the funding/implementation of the commemorative statue (separate project managed by Culture)

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
DCA	605,880	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operating Funded Non-Life Cycle	67,320	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**673,200**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Berczy Square Park - Design & Construction**

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

This park is not in the 2013 DC Background Study. Substitutions will be made to accommodate funding.

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$0
Quarter 2:	$200,000
Quarter 3:	$200,000
Quarter 4:	$200,000
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$600,000**
Year 2:	$73,200
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$673,200**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing: 16/01/2015

RFP/Tender Award by: 06/03/2015

Estimated Project Completion Date: 30/10/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Construction completed in 2015.

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Maintain Service Level

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

To construct this urban park in accordance with the approved Upper Unionville Community Design Plan.

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

Resident's park needs will not be met in a timely manner. William Berczy statue needs to be installed in 2014 which is a commemorative year of Berczy's birth.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$533,100**

Project Name: **Downstream Improvement Work SWM Strategy**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Development Services

Useful Life: 0

Department: Engineering

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☐

Project Mgr: Nehal Azamy

Category: Major

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Internal peer review

Requirement Validation: Visual inspection

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Update Erosion study to include 2031 development impact, define existing/anticipated erosion sites and prioritize for improvement.

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

Primary Objective: Growth Management

To define watercourse improvement requirements over the next 10 years.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	420,000	0
Internal Charges:	63,000	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 10	42,000	0
Sub Total:	525,000	0
HST Impact:	8,131	0
Total Project Cost:	**533,100**	**0**

NOTES

Erosion plans and phasing required to confirm capital requirements for next 10 years. Future phases will be identified upon the erosion study update.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
DCA	346,515	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-DC Growth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operating Funded Life Cycle	186,585	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**533,100**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Downstream Improvement Work SWM Strategy**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study
Hard-SWM City-wide Watercourses - Erosion Control		346,515	6,668,079
TOTAL FUNDING		346,515	6,668,079

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 identified in the DC Background Study is for 2013-2031.

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$0
Quarter 2:	$133,100
Quarter 3:	$200,000
Quarter 4:	$200,000
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$533,100**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$533,100**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	14/04/2014
RFP/Tender Award by:	20/05/2014
Estimated Project Completion Date:	22/12/2014

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Maintain Service Level

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

Stabilize embankment to prevent further erosion and undermining of watercourses .

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

Undermining watercourses and risk of damages to public/private properties.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$619,700**

Project Name: **Engineering Studies**

Ranking: 1 Studies/Pilot Programs

Commission: Development Services

Useful Life: 0

Department: Engineering

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☐

Project Mgr: Binu Korah

Category: Major

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

The Engineering Studies are as follows: a) Milliken Secondary Plan: Transportation and Master Servicing Study - The City is initiating a secondary plan process within the above area. As part of the process, there is a need to complete Transportation and Master Servicing Studies (TMSS) to understand the servicing impacts & mitigation measures to support the developments in this area. b) Cornell Secondary Plan: Transportation and Master Servicing Study - The City is initiating a secondary plan process within the above area. There is a need to complete a TMSS to understand the servicing impacts and mitigation measures to support the developments in this area. C) ePlan project - City is currently initiating a study to review the needs to implement the ePlan review process.

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

Primary Objective: Growth Management

Engineering studies to be undertaken to facilitate and plan for development within City of Markham.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	500,000	0
Internal Charges:	60,000	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 10	50,000	0
Sub Total:	610,000	0
HST Impact:	9,680	0
Total Project Cost:	**619,700**	**0**

NOTES

a) Milliken Secondary Plan: Transportation and Master Servicing Study :- $200,000 b) Cornell Secondary Plan: Transportation and Master Servicing Study :- $200,000 c) ePlan project:- $100,000

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
DCA	619,700	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**619,700**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Engineering Studies**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study
Hard-Studies City-wide		619,700	9,762,000
TOTAL FUNDING		619,700	9,762,000

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

Funding for this project will come from the studies section of the DC Background Study.

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$19,700
Quarter 2:	$100,000
Quarter 3:	$150,000
Quarter 4:	$150,000
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$419,700**
Year 2:	$200,000
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$619,700**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	06/04/2015
RFP/Tender Award by:	22/06/2015
Estimated Project Completion Date:	22/08/2016

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Increase Service Level

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

To plan for future development within City of Markham.

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

Delay in development.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

MARKHAM

Number:

Project Cost: **$324,600**

Project Name: **Highway 7 Streetscaping**

Ranking: 1 New Asset/Expansion

Commission: Development Services

Useful Life: 0

Department: Engineering

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☐

Project Mgr: Alberto Lim

Ward(s):

CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☑ 4 ☐

5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Category: Major

Cost Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

Requirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

This request is for additional funds for the Hwy 7 Streetscape project based on updated cost estimate from the Region of York for the City's share. In September 2011 Council authorized submission of a streetscape application to the Region of York and endorsed the proposed streetscape concept for the proposed Highway 7 widening by the Region from Verclaire Gate to Sciberras Road. In October, 2011 Region of York advised the City that widening of Highway7 was extended west to Town Centre Blvd. The City has already allocated $1,690,826.56 in Capital Account 11448 for the enhanced streetscape. As a condition of funding from the Region of york, it is a requirement that the City cost share 50% of enhanced streetscape, which totals up to $1,963,939.97. As per the Council Report on September 16, 2014, the balance of $273,113.41 will be requested in 2015 Budget.

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

Primary Objective: Growth Management

Streetscaping for Highway 7 as a part of Region of York and City of Markham initiative.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	273,113	0
Internal Charges:	32,774	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 5	13,656	0
Sub Total:	319,543	0
HST Impact:	5,047	0
Total Project Cost:	**324,600**	**0**

NOTES

This project is under Region of York control. Based on Region's updated cost estimate, City's 50% share of the enhanced streetscape costs is $1,963,939. Previously approved capital project #11448 in the amount of $1,690,826; hence requesting additional funds of $273,113.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
DCA	324,600	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**324,600**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Highway 7 Streetscaping**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study
Hard-Streetscape Hwy 7 Hwy 404 to Town Center Blvd		324,600	1,007,812
TOTAL FUNDING		324,600	1,007,812

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:	$0
Quarter 3:	$0
Quarter 4:	$0
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$0**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$324,600
Total All Years:	**$324,600**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

The account is required to provide a PO. Region of York to commence detailed design and construction. Construction estimated to be in 2016.

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Increase Service Level

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

Highway 7 improvements.

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

N/A

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

MARKHAM

Number:

Project Cost: **$534,800**

Project Name: **Highway 7 Watermain**

Ranking: 1 New Asset/Expansion

Commission: Development Services

Useful Life: 0

Department: Engineering

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☐

Project Mgr: Alberto Lim

Ward(s): CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☑ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Category: Major

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Request for additional funds for Project #13701 for Highway 7 Watermain Construction. The total project cost is estimated at $3,391,700. This will be included in the Region's tender for road widening in which the City has to provide for the watermain portion.

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

Primary Objective: Growth Management

Building for future developments along Highway 7.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	450,000	0
Internal Charges:	54,000	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 5	22,500	0
Sub Total:	526,500	0
HST Impact:	8,316	0
Total Project Cost:	**534,800**	**0**

NOTES

Total project cost is estimated at $3,391,700 (excluding internal chargeback and contingency). Previously approved capital project #13701 in the amount of $2,941,700. Requesting additional funds of $450,000. The project is being tendered as a part of the road widening of Highway 7 done by Region of York.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
Waterworks	534,800	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**534,800**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Highway 7 Watermain**

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:	$0
Quarter 2:	$0
Quarter 3:	$0
Quarter 4:	$534,800
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$534,800**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$534,800**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

To pay Region of York once work is completed as a part of Road Widening works.

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Increase Service Level

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

Infrastructure improvements to accommodate future developments.

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

Delay in developments

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$185,900**

Project Name: **Markham Centre - Parking Business Plan**

Ranking: 1 Studies/Pilot Programs

Commission: Development Services

Useful Life: 0

Department: Engineering

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: Brian Lee

Category: Major

Ward(s): CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☑ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Internal peer review

Requirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Development of a parking business plan in order to determine parking requirements in Markham Centre. This study will evaluate different business models for paid parking in Markham City and provide recommendations on governance model. The deliverables will include parking fee structure, estimation of revenue and costs to operate paid parking.

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

Primary Objective: Growth Management

Growth is supported by the timely provision of major infrastructure. The study will allow the City to determine the required phasing and transportation structures required to facilitate the development of Markham Centre.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	150,000	0
Internal Charges:	18,000	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 10	15,000	0
Sub Total:	183,000	0
HST Impact:	2,904	0
Total Project Cost:	**185,900**	**0**

NOTES

York University and other pending development in Markham Centre requires Markham to finalize parking business plan.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**	100 CWH				**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
DCA	185,900	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**185,900**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Markham Centre - Parking Business Plan**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study
Hard-Studies City-wide		185,900	9,762,000
TOTAL FUNDING		185,900	9,762,000

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:	$15,900
Quarter 2:	$60,000
Quarter 3:	$60,000
Quarter 4:	$50,000
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$185,900**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$185,900**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing: 12/01/2015

RFP/Tender Award by: 09/02/2015

Estimated Project Completion Date: 23/11/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Completed Study

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Maintain Service Level

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

Project is required to determine various aspect of parking in Markham Centre.

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

Development of Markham Centre will not incorporate parking requirements.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$557,700**

Project Name: **Markham Centre MESP Consolidation**

Ranking: 1 New Asset/Expansion

Commission: Development Services

Useful Life: 0

Department: Engineering

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☐

Project Mgr: Brian Lee

Category: Major

Ward(s): CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☑ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

Requirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

As required by the Toronto Regional Conservation Authority, this project is to consolidate previous, current and future required environmental studies within the Markham Centre area through a single comprehensive Master environmental Servicing Plan (MESP). Previous and current studies are fragmented and the City cannot proceed with further development in the area without completing this comprehenstive study. In addition, density increase in Markham Centre require servicing analysis/ update modelling.

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

Primary Objective: Growth Management

This study is in-line with new official plan, Markham's greenprint initiatives in terms of providing suitable guidance and direction to advance development within Markham Centre while managing growth and exercising responsible environmental stewardship.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	450,000	0
Internal Charges:	54,000	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 10	45,000	0
Sub Total:	549,000	0
HST Impact:	8,712	0
Total Project Cost:	**557,700**	**0**

NOTES

The city will retain a consultant to consolidate previous, current and required future environmental studies within the Markham Centre area in one comprehensive MESP which will assist the City in advancing development in the area and obtain TRCA/MNR approval. In addition, density increases in Markham Centre require servicing upgrades. Project cost includes $100k for TRCA Review Fee.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	Budget					TOTAL	Future Phases
DCA	557,700	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**557,700**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Markham Centre MESP Consolidation**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study
Hard-Studies City-wide		557,700	9,762,000
TOTAL FUNDING		557,700	9,762,000

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:	$57,700
Quarter 2:	$150,000
Quarter 3:	$150,000
Quarter 4:	$200,000
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$557,700**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$557,700**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing: 12/01/2015

RFP/Tender Award by: 16/03/2015

Estimated Project Completion Date: 19/10/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class:

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

Servicing Study of Markham Centre to determine the infrastructure and phasing of the work for future urban expansions.

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

Insufficient servicing for developments and delays in TRCA/MNR approvals.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$247,900**

Project Name: **Markham Centre Transportation Study**

Ranking: 1 Studies/Pilot Programs

Commission: Development Services

Useful Life: 0

Department: Engineering

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: Binu Korah

Category: Major

Ward(s): CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☑ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Internal peer review

Requirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

A transportation study for the Markham Centre, specifically to review transportation requirements for intensification of Markham Centre.

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

Primary Objective: Growth Management

The transportation study is an important component of the planning of the intensification of Markham Centre. The study will outline the transportation requirements and development phasing, transportation vision and strategic plan for managing the growth in the Markham Centre.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	200,000	0
Internal Charges:	24,000	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 10	20,000	0
Sub Total:	244,000	0
HST Impact:	3,872	0
Total Project Cost:	**247,900**	**0**

NOTES

Density increase in area and mobility hub study requires update to transportation study.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
DCA	247,900	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**247,900**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Markham Centre Transportation Study**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study
Hard-Studies City-wide		247,900	9,762,000
TOTAL FUNDING		247,900	9,762,000

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:	$37,900
Quarter 2:	$60,000
Quarter 3:	$75,000
Quarter 4:	$75,000
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$247,900**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$247,900**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing: 26/01/2015

RFP/Tender Award by: 09/03/2015

Estimated Project Completion Date: 21/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Completed Study

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Increase Service Level

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

To determine the infrastructure and phasing of the transportation works for Markham Centre.

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

Development proceeding without necessary transportation infrastructure.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$176,700**

Project Name: **Miller Avenue - Woodbine Avenue to Rodick (Property)**

Ranking: 1 New Asset/Expansion

Commission: Development Services

Useful Life: 0

Department: Engineering

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☐

Project Mgr: TBD

Category: Major

Ward(s): CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☑

Cost Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

Requirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Construction of Miller Avenue from Woodbine Avenue to Rodick Road. This is phase 5 of the project of Miller Avenue from Woodbine Ave to Kennedy Road. The detailed design has been awarded in August, 2014 and property is required for the new expansion as a part of the design alignment.

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

Primary Objective: Growth Management

To provide infrastructure for future developments in Markham Centre

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	145,000	0
Internal Charges:	21,750	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 5	7,250	0
Sub Total:	174,000	0
HST Impact:	2,680	0
Total Project Cost:	**176,700**	**0**

NOTES

The requested budget is for Site remediation, storm sewer, sanitary sewer and watermain replacement. It is expected to be constructed in 2015. Road construction is expected to be commence in 2016 and is not included in this budget.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
DCA	176,700	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**176,700**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Miller Avenue - Woodbine Avenue to Rodick (Property)**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study
Hard-Roads Miller Ave Woodbine Ave to Rodick Rd	2013	176,700	4,460,390
TOTAL FUNDING		176,700	4,460,390

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

DC Background Study includes construction costs.

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$0
Quarter 2:	$0
Quarter 3:	$0
Quarter 4:	$176,700
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$176,700**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$176,700**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

N/A

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Maintain Service Level

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

Accommodate additional E/W road for Markham Centre.

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

Congestion of future roads

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$38,100**

Project Name: **Transportation Demand Management Studies**

Ranking: 1 Studies/Pilot Programs

Commission: Development Services

Useful Life: 0

Department: Engineering

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☐

Project Mgr: Brian Lee

Ward(s):

CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐

5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Category: Annual

Cost Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

Requirement Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Implementation of programs to promote the reduction in automobile use, including School and community Out-reach, Car Pooling, bicycle racks and supporting conference. Included is salary/benefits for one (1) TDM Coordinator.

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

Primary Objective: Transportation & Transit

Implementation and promote programs in accordance to City policies on transportation demand management.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	30,000	0
Internal Charges:	4,500	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 10	3,000	0
Sub Total:	37,500	0
HST Impact:	581	0
Total Project Cost:	**38,100**	**0**

NOTES

TDM policy and planning implementation related to development and parking management. Active and safe routes to school program support and implementation. Community TDM program development to support transit, active transportatin and special events. Close Project # 12053.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
DCA	38,100	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**38,100**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Transportation Demand Management Studies**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study
Hard-Studies City-wide		38,100	9,762,000
TOTAL FUNDING		38,100	9,762,000

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:	$0
Quarter 3:	$38,100
Quarter 4:	$0
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$38,100**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$38,100**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing: 15/06/2015

RFP/Tender Award by: 14/09/2015

Estimated Project Completion Date: 22/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Maintain Service Level

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

Transportation demand management has become vital to managing population growth ty linking land use and development with transportation planning and implementation. Quality of life, community sustainability and travel mode shifting objectives are supported and enhanced by implementing TDM policies, programs and services.

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

City leadership role in promoting commuter options and intergrating TDM into land use and transit investments would be reduced or eliminated.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

Provide an expanded road network to accomodiate an increase in single occupant vehicle travel.

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$165,500**

Project Name: **Museum Annual Building Maintenance Program**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Department: Museum

Project Mgr: Cathy Molloy

Useful Life: 0

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Category: Minor

Cost Validation: Other(specify in Notes)

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Repair replacement of components of various structures. Replacement of kitchen or bathroom fixtures and/or cabinets and/or flooring. This is an annual ask for on-going upkeep of the Museum structures.

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

Primary Objective: Growth Management

When the Museum structures are kept in a state of good repair the Museum is able to plan for short and longer term programs. The Museum is able to provide a safe environment for the public.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	162,600	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	162,600	0
HST Impact:	2,862	0
Total Project Cost:	**165,500**	**0**

NOTES

Repair replacement of exterior cladding on various structures. Replacement of kitchen or bathroom fixtures and/or capinets and/or flooring. This is an annual ask for on-going upkeep of the Museum structures. Projects for 2015 include Mount Joy School washrooms ($35k), kitchen cabinets in the Church ($29K), cladding on the Blacksmith Shop ($25K), exterior painting of Chapman House ($30K) and the flooring in the Cider Mill ($10K). Other smaller projects in other structures ($34K).
*This is an annual program and funding will be requested each year. **Pre-approval of $35k for Mount Joy School washrooms is required with anticipated completion by late February for Winterfest and March break camps.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
Operating Funded Life Cycle	165,500	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**165,500**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Museum Annual Building Maintenance Program**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	734,800
Amount Incl HST	165,500
Year in the study	2015

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

Life Cycle includes Baptist Church($86,700), Blacksmith Shop($37,900), Burkholder Carriage house($14,500), Burkholder house($29,900), Chapman house($126,800), Cider Mill($37,900), Harness Shop($31,900), Hoover($10,000), Maxwell($123,200), Mt Joy($223,321)

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$35,000
Quarter 2:	$50,500
Quarter 3:	$55,000
Quarter 4:	$25,000
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$165,500**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$165,500**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date: 31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Various small purchases all less than $25,000

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: Recurring Project – Maintain/Increase Service Level and increase in funding

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

The Museum structures require on-going maintenance and repairs to ensure safe and accessible programming. The cost of this program will increase with inflation.

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

The Museum building will deteriorate to a state where they are unsafe for public programming. If maintenance and repair work is delayed and damage results, the costs will be higher.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: $230,800

Project Name: **Clatworthy Arena Rinkboard & Glass Replacement**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 30

Department: Recreation Services

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: Rob Hartnett

Ward(s): CW ☐ 1 ☑ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Category: Minor

Cost Validation: Third party estimate

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Replacement of the arena board structure and glass supports including replacement of glass on rink ends, player's boxes and timekeeper's boxes.

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

Primary Objective: Greenprint

The Recreation Department is proud to support the Greenprint pillar of social and cultural well-being through the development of healthy relationships and healthy lifestyles within the Community. Completion of this project enables the Recreation Department the opportunity to continue fulfilling this mission - specifically this project provides necessary improvements to a space used for community gathering and meeting and skill development & enhancement program delivery.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	206,200	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 10	20,620	0
Sub Total:	226,820	0
HST Impact:	3,992	0
Total Project Cost:	**230,800**	**0**

NOTES

Existing board structure is 33 years old and made mostly of wood. The boards are decaying and now have movement, meaning they are becoming structurally weak. Because of the wood component, there is a good possibility mold will be found in the structure which may require some abatement. The new board system constructed of aluminum, which have a significantly longer life cycle and increase participant safety due to board give. This project includes necessary accessibility upgrades as Clatworthy Arena is regularly used for sledge hockey. Accessibility upgrades include clear panel boards at the gates, flush accessibility onto the ice surface, wide gate and sledge friendly flooring.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**					**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
Operating Funded Life Cycle	230,800	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**230,800**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Clatworthy Arena Rinkboard & Glass Replacement**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	37,000
Amount Incl HST	230,800
Year in the study	2015

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

Work has been deferred from 2014 to 2015. Funds allocated in 2014 and 2015 as per the life cycle reserve study will be sufficient to fund the project. $37k in the life cycle reserve study represents 2015 funds only.

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$0
Quarter 2:	$230,800
Quarter 3:	$0
Quarter 4:	$0
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$230,800**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$230,800**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	1/30/2015
RFP/Tender Award by:	3/3/2015
Estimated Project Completion Date:	5/29/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Maintain Service Level

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

The existing board structure is 33 years old and the framing is primarily constructed of wood. The wood is deteriorated and with insufficient dehumidification in the facility, we are anticipating a certain amount of mold growth when the boards are opened up. Sections of the board structure have become weak and can be prone to failure. This can pose a risk to the patrons using the facility.

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

A failure of the board system would close the facility until temporary repairs can be carried out. It would become a potential liability to the city if it does not move ahead.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

Due to the age, condition and possible mold issues, it needs to be replaced. Wood construction is not practical due to rot and mold. A steel galvanized system, will last but due to being rigid, a greater potential for injury can result. An aluminum system which is proposed has flex to the system to prevent injuries and does not deteriorate.

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$51,800**

Project Name: **Boulevard Repairs**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 10

Department: Operations - Roads

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☐

Project Mgr: John Hoover

Category: Minor

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Repairs to boulevards throughout the City including interlocking brick pavers, asphalt and/or concrete boulevard sections. Maintain boulevard areas in good condition to minimize hazards for pedestrians.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

This program ensures pedestrian and vehicular safely navigate the municipal boulevard.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	50,900	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	50,900	0
HST Impact:	896	0
Total Project Cost:	**51,800**	**0**

NOTES

Lifecycle program. 2015 locations total approximately 1800 m2. Cost per square metre is $28.75 (incl. HST impact) based on latest contract award. 3-yr avg actuals: $38.4k . Ask is higher than 3 yr average due to poor contractor performance in 2013. Funds within this project may be reallocated to a location that requires immediate attention unforseen at time of submission. This program and funding will be requested each year.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**	Angus Glen CC (400m2)	Thornhill CC (200m2)	Various Speed Humps (180m2)	Other smaller locations (1021.5 m2)	**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
Operating Funded Life Cycle	51,800	11,500	5,750	5,175	29,375	51,800	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**51,800**					**51,800**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Boulevard Repairs**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study: 51,800

Amount Incl HST 51,800

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:	$10,800
Quarter 3:	$41,000
Quarter 4:	$0
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$51,800**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$51,800**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing: 02/02/2015

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Renewal

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.

Risk management issue addressing settlement in boulevards/cross walks in order to remove trip hazards for pedestrians. Also addresses repairs behind tree repairs on all BIA locations.

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

Increase in claims from pedestrian accidents on blvd.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

n/a

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$46,500**

Project Name: **Bridge Structure Preventative Maintenance**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 30

Department: Operations - Roads

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: Jon Styles/Craig Breen/Parks Supervisor

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Category: Minor

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Annual preventative maintenance of bridge/culvert structures.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

Preventative maintenance of bridge/culvert structures will lower safety risks for residents and allows for ease of use of sidewalks, pathways and roadways. Maintenance practices recognizes partnerships with Toronto Region Conservation Authority, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and Ministry of Environment for scheduling activities.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	45,700	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	45,700	0
HST Impact:	804	0
Total Project Cost:	**46,500**	**0**

NOTES

Life cycle program. Work to include; fill and grade bridge approaches, route and seal cracks on bridge decks, concrete sealer application , remove and replace wooden decks on pedestrian bridges, concrete patches in approach curb and abutment and siltation removal from culverts. This program resides in Asset Management's lifecycle and has been in place since 2012. This program and funding will be requested each year.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
Operating Funded Life Cycle	46,500	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**46,500**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Bridge Structure Preventative Maintenance**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	46,500
Amount Incl HST	46,500
Year in the study	2015

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:	$0
Quarter 3:	$23,250
Quarter 4:	$23,250
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$46,500**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$46,500**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	01/02/2015
RFP/Tender Award by:	02/03/2015
Estimated Project Completion Date:	31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

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.

Legislated maintenance requirements will not be met. Program is intended to align to those standards.

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

Premature deterioration of bridge and culvert structures.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

n/a

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$103,500**

Project Name: **Emergency Repairs**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 20

Department: Operations - Roads

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: Jon Styles/Craig Breen

Category: Annual

Ward(s):

CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐
5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Visual inspection

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Emergency repairs to guiderails, guide cable, storm sewers, outfalls, inlets, and cross connections as required and/or due to motor vehicle accidents, winter maintenance and damage from storm water or pipe/road failures.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

Program makes roads and boulevards immediately safe for all pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Program considers increased storm volumes and cause for infrastructure failures. This program works to improve storm water management and supporting infrastructure.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	101,700	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	101,700	0
HST Impact:	1,790	0
Total Project Cost:	**103,500**	**0**

NOTES

Examples of work done in previous years include storm sewer repairs at 351 John Street, 2 Chase Court and 8100 Warden Avenue. 3 yr avg. 207K. 3 year average is higher due to the Henderson Ave Storm Sewer Failure in 2013. This program and funding will be requested each year.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
Operating Funded Life Cycle	103,500	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**103,500**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Emergency Repairs**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	103,500
Amount Incl HST	103,500
Year in the study	2015

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:	$51,750
Quarter 3:	$51,750
Quarter 4:	$0
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$103,500**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$103,500**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date:

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Renewal Finch Paving - Waterworks PO

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.

Allow for immediate repairs to infrastructure failures in order to maintain safe vehicle, pedestrian and storm water networks.

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

Risk of damage to private and public properties

iv) What alternatives were considered?

n/a

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$535,700**

Project Name: **Localized Repairs - Curb & Sidewalk**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 20

Department: Operations - Roads

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: John Hoover

Category: Minor

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐ 5☐ 6☐ 7☐ 8☐

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Maintenance repairs to sidewalks, curbs, and catch basins throughout the City based on condition assessments. Ensure that deficient sections are repaired to minimize trip and fall incidents and reduce associated liability to the City.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

Program ensures roads and boulevards are made safe for all cyclists, pedestrians and vehicular traffic. Program removes hazards, deficiencies, and reduces risk to the City by replacing with new concrete.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	526,400	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	526,400	0
HST Impact:	9,265	0
Total Project Cost:	**535,700**	**0**

NOTES

Based on condition assessments. In 2013 completed approximatley 5,331 sqm of sidewalk @$90/sqm, 1625lm of curb @ 85/lm and 59 catch basin adjustments @ 195/ea. 3-yr avg actuals: $535K. This program and funding will be requested each year.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
Operating Funded Life Cycle	535,700	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**535,700**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Localized Repairs - Curb & Sidewalk**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	561,700
Amount Incl HST	535,700
Year in the study	2015

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

2015 Life Cycle Reserve Study update will be adjusted to reflect the 3 year average.

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$0
Quarter 2:	$133,750
Quarter 3:	$321,420
Quarter 4:	$80,530
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$535,700**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$535,700**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	03/11/2014
RFP/Tender Award by:	22/12/2014
Estimated Project Completion Date:	31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

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.

Addresses minor repair locations of curb and sidewalk failures in order to extend the lifecycle. Identified in lifecycle reserve.

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

Addresses risk management issues relative to pedestrian traffic as well as the storm sewer system.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

n/a

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$103,500**

Project Name: **Parking Lots - Localized Repairs**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Department: Operations - Roads

Project Mgr: John Hoover

Useful Life: 8

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Category: Minor

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Ongoing maintenance and repairs of municipal parking lots throughout the City. Includes repairs to concrete, asphalt infrastructure, maintenance holes and catchbasin adjustments and asphalt resurfacing.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

Program recognizes Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) guidelines and aligns these guidelines to all City parking lots. Program calls for consideration of recycled construction materials.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	101,700	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	101,700	0
HST Impact:	1,790	0
Total Project Cost:	**103,500**	**0**

NOTES

2015 locations for parking lot repairs include Centennial Arena, Milliken Mills Community Centre, Ashton Meadows, Markham Seniors Center and Miller Yard. 3 yr average is unavailable due to this being the first year of Localized Repairs, separated from the Rehabilitation project. This program and funding will be requested each year.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	Budget					TOTAL	Future Phases
Operating Funded Life Cycle	103,500	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**103,500**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Parking Lots - Localized Repairs**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	103,500
Amount Incl HST	103,500
Year in the study	2015

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:	$25,000
Quarter 3:	$50,000
Quarter 4:	$28,500
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$103,500**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$103,500**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	03/11/2014
RFP/Tender Award by:	22/12/2014
Estimated Project Completion Date:	31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

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.

Identified in lifecycle reserve. Condition assessment dictates locations.

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

If not approved conditions will deteriorate and claims for personal injury and property will escalate.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

N/A

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$38,200**

Project Name: **Parking Lots- Rehabilitation**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 20

Department: Operations - Roads

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: John Hoover

Category: Minor

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐ 5☐ 6☐ 7☐ 8☐

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Complete rehabilitation of selected municipal parking lots throughout the City. Includes removal and replacement of concrete, interlock and asphalt infrastructure, as well as maintenance holes and catchbasin adjustments.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

Program recognizes Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) guidelines and aligns these guidelines to all City parking lots. Program calls for consideration of recycled construction materials. Current strategies recognize reduced energy costs/emmisions are a direct result of using recycled asphalt.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	37,546	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	37,546	0
HST Impact:	661	0
Total Project Cost:	**38,200**	**0**

NOTES

Rehabilitation of parking lot at Fire Station 94, located at 7300 Birchmount Road. 3 year average is not applicable due to this being the first year of the Rehabilitation program, separate from the Localized Repairs.This program and funding will be requested each year.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
Operating Funded Life Cycle	38,200	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**38,200**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Parking Lots- Rehabilitation**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	388,700
Amount Incl HST	38,200
Year in the study	2015

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

Only 38K required out of the 388K in life cycle. Remaining $350k supports the joint Civic Centre Improvement for Civic Centre parking lot, i.e., Asset Management, Operations-Roads, Public Realm which will be requested under an Asset Management project.

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$0
Quarter 2:	$0
Quarter 3:	$38,200
Quarter 4:	$0
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$38,200**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$38,200**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	02/02/2015
RFP/Tender Award by:	02/03/2015
Estimated Project Completion Date:	31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

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.

Identified in lifecycle reserve. Condition assessment dictates locations.

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

If not approved conditions will deteriorate and claims for personal injury and property will escalate.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

n/a

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$50,400**

Project Name: **Railway Crossing Improvements**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 8

Department: Operations - Roads

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: John Hoover

Category: Annual

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Maintenance repairs to level railway crossings Citywide. CN-CP-GO transit systems. Rehabilitation of the level crossings that the City is responsible for. Remove the existing crossing material and replace it with rubber mud rails and asphalt.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

Program consists of re-leveling crossings to allow for safe pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	49,530	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	49,530	0
HST Impact:	872	0
Total Project Cost:	**50,400**	**0**

NOTES

Locations for 2015 are Main Street Unionville, Reesor Road north of 14th Avenue and Langstaff Road. Funding amount changes every year based on life cycle of specific railway crossings. This program and funding will be requested each year.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components: Main Street Unionville	Reesor Road & 14th Ave	Langstaff Road	Various	TOTAL	Future Phases
Operating Funded Life Cycle	50,400	15,932	15,208	12,260	7,000	50,400	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**50,400**					**50,400**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Railway Crossing Improvements**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	50,400
Amount Incl HST	50,400
Year in the study	2015

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:	$0
Quarter 3:	$50,400
Quarter 4:	$0
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$50,400**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$50,400**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	02/02/2015
RFP/Tender Award by:	02/03/2015
Estimated Project Completion Date:	31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

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.

Identified in lifecycle reserve. Condition assessment dictates location.

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

If not approved conditions deteriorate and claims for personal injury and property loss escalate.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

n/a

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$289,500**

Project Name: **Secondary Roadworks**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 10

Department: Operations - Roads

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☐

Project Mgr: Mike Brady

Category: Minor

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Pavement preservation of roads throughout the City - Candidate streets determined utilizing a Pavement Management Program. This project is designed to enhance and extend the life of asphalt surfaces through the application of preservation treatments. Service Level is maintained or increased and pavement life is extended thereby reducing overall life cycle costs.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

While recognizing the importance of maintaining access and mobility for citizens, this program has worked with other partners for quantification of network and strategy selection. This program recognizes reduced energy costs and emmision contribution when selecting strategies.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	284,478	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	284,478	0
HST Impact:	5,007	0
Total Project Cost:	**289,500**	**0**

NOTES

Pavement preservation of approximately 6 km of two lane roadway. Program funded from Secondary Roadworks Reserve. Amount remaining in reserve fund prior to 2015 is $289,485. Streets planned for 2015 are sections of Alfred Patterson, 14th Ave and Bur Oak.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
Road Reserve	289,500	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**289,500**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Secondary Roadworks**

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:	$0
Quarter 2:	$0
Quarter 3:	$289,500
Quarter 4:	$0
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$289,500**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$289,500**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing: 01/04/2015

RFP/Tender Award by: 01/05/2015

Estimated Project Completion Date: 31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Renewal

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.

This project is designed to enhance and extend the life of asphalt surfaces through the application of preservation treatments. Service level is maintained or increased and pavement life is extended thereby reducing overall life cycle costs.

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

Pavement will deteriorate much faster without required maintenance work and at an earlier stage in the lifecycle. Maintenance and rehabilitation costs may also increase due to deterioration of the road base.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

Crack sealing also forms part of the overall pavement preservation program. We continue to investigate and perform trials with new and emerging preservation treatments, with the overall goal of applying the most cost effective treatments.

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$326,900**

Project Name: **Paving Pathways/Facilities & Stairways Repairs**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 15

Department: Operations - Parks

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: John Hoover/James Bingham

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐ 5☐ 6☐ 7☐ 8☐

Category: Minor

Cost Validation: Multiple(specify)

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Paving and repairs of pathways, facilities and stairways at various parks and locations. These locations are prone to wear and tear and washouts following heavy rain and flooding. Paving will help to alleviate this problem. Locations will be assessed and determined based on condition assessment in spring for completion by year end. Staff will investigate environmental options for future considerations

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

Primary Objective: Integrated Leisure Master Plan/Public Safety

The paving of pathways and stairways repairs will maintain safe access to the parks so residents can interact with members of their community while enjoying the opportunity to walk, run or cycle, maintaining an active lifestyle; This project allows for a safe positive social activity by providing well maintained access to parks, community centers and path systems. Hard surfaces provide greater accessibility for all park users.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	321,200	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	321,200	0
HST Impact:	5,653	0
Total Project Cost:	**326,900**	**0**

NOTES

Lifecycle program; Cost Validation: Internal peer review for Paving; Stairways repairs - internal peer review; Stairways locations - Framington and German Mills; Paving locations - to be determined; Funding may be reallocated within the project as required; Estimated area for Paving - Concrete-250 sq.m & Asphalt- 3,000 sq.m. This program and funding will be requested each year. 3 year average-$124k for paving only; Stairways repairs project commenced in 2013, will be completed in 2014; Pre-approval for paving component - $124k which utilizes the Roads contracts.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**	Paving	Stairways			**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
Operating Funded Life Cycle	326,900	123,900	203,000	0	0	326,900	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**326,900**					**326,900**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Paving Pathways/Facilities & Stairways Repairs**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	326,900
Amount Incl HST	326,900
Year in the study	2015

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:	$43,020
Quarter 3:	$240,860
Quarter 4:	$43,020
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$326,900**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$326,900**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	01/12/2014
RFP/Tender Award by:	01/01/2015
Estimated Project Completion Date:	31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Paving contracts (Asphalt & Concrete) - to be piggyback with Roads contract; Stairways repairs - separate purchase order

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: Recurring Project – Maintain/Increase Service Level and increase in funding

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

Paving granular pathways that washout to address safety hazards caused by erosion and stairways repairs further enhances accessibility for park patrons.

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

Liability to City for personal injuries. Increased maintenance costs of granular surfaces

iv) What alternatives were considered?

Continued maintenance costs of granular surfaces

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$939,900**

Project Name: **Playstructure & Rubberized Safety Surface Replacement**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 15

Department: Operations - Parks

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: James Bingham

Category: Annual

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: External peer review

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Replacement of playground equipment at 12 locations and rubberized safety surface at 1 location - , as required, to maintain the 2007 standards (CSA -Canadian Standards Association CAN/CSA-Z614-07"Children's Playspaces and Equipment").

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

Primary Objective: Integrated Leisure Master Plan/Public Safety

The playgrounds provide an opportunity for residents of all ages to interact with members of their community; This project allows for positive social activity for all in a safe environment while utilizing municipal playground equipment.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	908,650	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	15,000	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	923,650	0
HST Impact:	16,256	0
Total Project Cost:	**939,900**	**0**

NOTES

Playground Structure: Angus Glen Village, Avoca, Fincham, Glencrest, Personna, Pioneer, Pomona Mills, Proctor, Reeve, The Mews, Thomas Frisby, Thornlea East and Windfields; Rubberized Surface: The Mews. This is an annual program and funding will be requested each year. Funding amount changes every year based on life cycle of specific playstructures/safety surface. Funding may be reallocated within the project components. Pre-approval for 2 locations -($103,300) - 1) Personna-condition assessment has shown serious heaving necessitating closure; 2) Glencrest-accelerated from 2020 to 2015 due to condition assessment.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**	Equipment/Structure	Rubberized Surface	Personna/Glencrest		**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
Operating Funded Life Cycle	939,900	785,000	51,600	103,300	0	939,900	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**939,900**					**939,900**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Playstructure & Rubberized Safety Surface Replacement**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	1,518,400
Amount Incl HST	939,900
Year in the study	2015

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

Deferred due to condition assessment/visual inspection-Alma Walker, Amber Glen, Benjamin Marr, Chelsea, Green Lane, Nordlingen, Stargell,Victoria Square; ET Crowle-pending ownership confirmation;Glencrest accelerated from 2020 due to condition assessment

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$0
Quarter 2:	$103,300
Quarter 3:	$836,641
Quarter 4:	$0
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$939,941**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$939,941**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	01/12/2014
RFP/Tender Award by:	01/01/2015
Estimated Project Completion Date:	31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

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.

These units have now reached their life expectancy and do not meet the new CSA guidelines.

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

Legislative requirements not being met.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

Continued repair to substantially comply only

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$120,000**

Project Name: **Sportsfield Maintenance & Reconstruction**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 5

Department: Operations - Parks

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: James Bingham

Category: Annual

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐ 5☐ 6☐ 7☐ 8☐

Cost Validation: Internal peer review

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

There are 212 sportsfields existing in various parks and schools which consist of baseball diamonds, rugby, soccer, cricket and football fields. Fields are scheduled for renovation every year by various degrees depending on condition. Locations to be determined each spring and again at the end of playing season based on inspection of fields. Average expenditures per sportsfield vary depending on use, wear & tear and weather conditions

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

Primary Objective: Integrated Leisure Master Plan/Public Safety

Sportsfields provide an opportunity for residents of all ages to remain active while interacting with members of their community; Sportsfields allow for teams to participate in community based programs; Well maintained sportsfields provide for a safe and positive experience for all participants

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	117,925	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	117,925	0
HST Impact:	2,075	0
Total Project Cost:	**120,000**	**0**

NOTES

Lifecycle program includes top dressing, grass seed, sod, fertilizer, irrigation upgrades; Funds within this project may be reallocated to sportsfield maintenance materials and services that require immediate attention unforseen at time of submission such as sodding of damaged fields. This is an annual program and funding will be requested each year. 3 year average at $120k (2011-2013)

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**					**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
Operating Funded Life Cycle	120,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**120,000**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Sportsfield Maintenance & Reconstruction**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	103,300
Amount Incl HST	120,000
Year in the study	2015

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

Project cost based on 3 year average; 2015 Lifecycle to be adjusted accordingly

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$0
Quarter 2:	$34,430
Quarter 3:	$34,430
Quarter 4:	$51,140
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$120,000**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$120,000**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	01/12/2014
RFP/Tender Award by:	01/02/2015
Estimated Project Completion Date:	31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

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.

Maintain safe, playable sports fields.

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

Personal injuries due to deterioration of sportsfields.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

MARKHAM

Number:

Project Cost: **$408,000**

Project Name: **Traffic Control Signal Design & Construction**

Ranking: 2 New Asset/Expansion

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 30

Department: Operations - Traffic

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: Ravali Kosaraju

Category: Annual

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Design and construction of traffic signals at two (2) intersections within Markham: Bur Oak Avenue and Stonebridge Drive (tentative) & Bur Oak Avenue and William Berczy Boulevard (tentative). Justification for traffic signals pending intersection assessments scheduled for Fall 2014.

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

Primary Objective: Transportation & Transit

New traffic signal installations are identified based on technical warrants and traffic operational condition assessment. Traffic signals improve intersection safety and efficiency and provide safe locations for pedestrian crossings. Optimized traffic signal timings will ensure that the needs of both vehicular and pedestrian traffic are being achieved.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	341,730	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	22,800	0
Contingency %: 10	36,453	0
Sub Total:	400,983	0
HST Impact:	7,057	0
Total Project Cost:	**408,000**	**0**

NOTES

Pre-approval request for $25,500. Project cost breakdown - Consultancy Services ($25K), Construction ($355K), Controllers ($28K); Bur Oak Avenue & Stonebridge Drive - 100% DCA funded (2013 DC Study); Bur Oak Avenue and William Berczy Boulevard - 100% DCA funded (2013 DC Study). To be justified based on intersection assessments. This is an annual program and funding will be requested each year (pending technical assessments).

2013 DC Study - Appendix C Table 2 Page 2 (Berczy area - 5 Future Signalized intersections) Non personnel induced operating costs are for annual maintenance of intersection $1975.00 each

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**					**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
DCA	408,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**408,000**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$3,950	$0	$3,950

Project Name: **Traffic Control Signal Design & Construction**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study
Hard-Intersection Berzcy Future Signalized Intersections (5)		408,000	1,020,036
TOTAL FUNDING		408,000	1,020,036

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 are for 3 other intersections.

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$12,500
Quarter 2:	$10,000
Quarter 3:	$192,750
Quarter 4:	$192,750
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$408,000**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$408,000**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing: 15/01/2015

RFP/Tender Award by: 02/02/2015

Estimated Project Completion Date: 31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Multiple PO's Consultant and Construction

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Increase Service Level

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

To improve safety and level of service in the intersection for both vehicles and pedestrians.

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

Existing safety and level of service issues will persist.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

Existing and alternative traffic controls are not feasible to address existing traffic/pedestrians demands at the subject locations

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: $36,100

Project Name: **Corporate Fleet Refurbishing**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 3

Department: Operations - Fleet

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: Laurie Canning

Category: Annual

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Internal peer review

Requirement Validation: Multiple(specify)

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Equipment and vehicles require periodic refurbishing and corrosion protection to meet the Ministry of Transportation safety requirements and to ensure life cycle requirements are met for vehicles such as Fire Department apparatus, Operations construction equipment and heavy trucks. Ongoing rust proofing program to meet current lifecycle requirements. Program reduces maintenance costs and keeps equipment in presentable condition.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

Providing reliable fleet units allowing effective municipal services to local residents and businesses. Promoting the continued use of new technology along with alternate energy solutions that reduce fuel consumption and improved fleet efficiencies with reductions in overall fleet emissions.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	35,500	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	35,500	0
HST Impact:	625	0
Total Project Cost:	**36,100**	**0**

NOTES

Lifecycle Program; Project includes rust protection, body work & painting; Requirement Validation - Condition assessment & legislative compliance. This is an annual program and funding will be requested each year. 3 year average is $36k

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

Funding Type	Budget	Components				TOTAL	Future Phases
Operating Funded Life Cycle	36,100	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**36,100**					**0**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Corporate Fleet Refurbishing**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	36,100
Amount Incl HST	36,100
Year in the study	2015

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:	$9,025
Quarter 2:	$9,025
Quarter 3:	$9,025
Quarter 4:	$9,025
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$36,100**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$36,100**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date: 31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Purchasing involvement not required

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.

Equipment and vehicles require periodic refurbishing and corrosion protection to meet the Ministry of Transportation safety requirements and to ensure life cycle requirements are met for vehicles.

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

Vehicles will not meet lifecycle replacement criteria and will need to be replaced sooner.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

Rent/Lease

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$1,152,900**

Project Name: **Roofing Replacement Projects**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 20

Department: Asset Mgmt - Facility Assets

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: Atiq Rahman

Category: Major

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Internal peer review

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

This project includes roofing and accessories replacement works at various locations throughout the City.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

Maintaining existing facilities through the Life Cycle program in order to maintain service levels. The Life Cycle process systematically reviews work required, using industry standard guiding principles to set priorities for each year. Where construction will be done, every effort will be made to utilize greener materials, and environmentally safe disposal of waste.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	1,132,986	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	1,132,986	0
HST Impact:	19,941	0
Total Project Cost:	**1,152,900**	**0**

NOTES

Civic Centre $529,830
Crosby West Roof (Area A) $79,886
Milliken Mills Library $257,409
Others (Museum Little Theatre, Kinney Log Barn, Milne Park Shop, Victoria Square CC Entrance): $285,795. Costs include technical consulting fees. *This is an annual program & funding will be requested each year for different types of improvements at different amounts.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**	Civic Centre	Crosby West-Area-A	Milliken Library	Other	**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
Operating Funded Life Cycle	1,152,900	529,830	79,866	257,409	285,795	1,152,900	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**1,152,900**					**1,152,900**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Roofing Replacement Projects**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	1,109,200
Amount Incl HST	1,152,900
Year in the study	2015

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

LC study has $1,109,200 for 2015 roofing, however project requires additional $43,700 because of increase in Cedar Shingle cost for Museum Kinney Log barn, based on recent tender on Cedar Shingle roofs.

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$50,000
Quarter 2:	$50,000
Quarter 3:	$350,967
Quarter 4:	$350,967
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$801,934**
Year 2:	$350,966
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$1,152,900**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	16/02/2015
RFP/Tender Award by:	15/04/2015
Estimated Project Completion Date:	31/07/2016

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

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.

High priority to avoid building damage and eliminate customer program disruption

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

Delaying projects will result in higher roofing maintenance costs and potential for increased building damage and customer program disruption.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$200,000**

Project Name: **Erosion Restoration- 110/130 Denison Street (Construction)**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 15

Department: Asset Mgmt -Environmental Assets

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: Rob Muir

Category: Minor

Ward(s): CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☑

Cost Validation: External peer review

Requirement Validation: Visual inspection

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Erosion protection along the Don Mills Channel at 110/130 Denison Street.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

Erosion restoration of Watercourse will enhance and protect the quality of the watercourses and provide safety for adjoining properties.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	196,500	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	196,500	0
HST Impact:	3,458	0
Total Project Cost:	**200,000**	**0**

NOTES

The July 27, 2014 storm, resulted in slope failure and blockage of 2 storm outfall structures along the Don Mills Channel at 110/130 Denison Street. This has created a safety hazard for parked cars and trucks using adjacent loading areas. Parking barriers have been placed around the affected areas preventing cars being parked. Pre-approval is being requested as the area is still unstable and continues to pose a safety risk.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**	Construction				**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
DCA	128,800	128,800	0	0	0	128,800	0
Operating Funded Life Cycle	71,200	71,200	0	0	0	71,200	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**200,000**					**200,000**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Erosion Restoration- 110/130 Denison Street (Construction)**

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

Under City Watercourse Erosion Control as per DC Background Study.

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$200,000
Quarter 2:	$0
Quarter 3:	$0
Quarter 4:	$0
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$200,000**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$200,000**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing: 30/10/2014

RFP/Tender Award by: 13/11/2014

Estimated Project Completion Date: 30/04/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

100% completion of construction works.

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Maintain Service Level

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

Improper slope and blockage of outfall structures will result in safety hazards.

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

If the erosion restoration is not done in a timely manner, it will pose a safety hazard for the adjoining properties. It will also add a potential liability regarding easement maintenace obligations.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$63,200**

Project Name: **Bridges and Culverts - Condition Inspection**

Ranking: 1 Studies/Pilot Programs

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 0

Department: Asset Mgmt - Right-of-way Assets

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: Prathapan Kumar

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Category: Annual

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Multiple(specify)

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Program to conduct Detailed Visual Inspection of City-owned structures (bridges and culverts). Bi-annual inspection of structures is mandated by Public Transportation and Highway Act - Regulation 104/97.

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

Primary Objective: Transportation & Transit

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

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	0	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	62,100	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	62,100	0
HST Impact:	1,093	0
Total Project Cost:	**63,200**	**0**

NOTES

This is an annual program and funding requirements will be requested each year. This program ensures inspections take place within the regulated timelines. Inspection of structures needs to be carried out to meet the legislative requirements to ensure public safety and to develop a cost effective structures rehabilitation program. 110 structures are scheduled for 2015 inspection out of a total of 320 structures.
Requirement validations: Visual Inspection and Legislative Compliance.
Average 3 year (2012 – 2014) expenditure:$53K.
Lower average as 2014 inspection included fewer structures.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**	Inspection				**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
Operating Funded Life Cycle	63,200	63,200	0	0	0	63,200	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**63,200**					**63,200**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Bridges and Culverts - Condition Inspection**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	63,200
Amount Incl HST	63,200
Year in the study	2015

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:	$31,600
Quarter 2:	$31,600
Quarter 3:	$0
Quarter 4:	$0
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$63,200**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$63,200**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	05/01/2015
RFP/Tender Award by:	10/02/2015
Estimated Project Completion Date:	31/08/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Inspection completed and reports received from the Consultant.

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.

All structures must undergo visual inspection within the regulated time lines as mandated by Public and Highway Transportation Act - Regulation 104/97 to ensure public safety. Based on the inspection recommendations, a cost-effective structures capital / maintenance program will be developed.

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

In violation of legislative requirements.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None.

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$156,500**

Project Name: **Former Sabiston Landfill - Monitoring**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 0

Department: Asset Mgmt - Right-of-way Assets

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: Bob Penner

Category: Major

Ward(s): CW ☐ 1 ☑ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Legislative compliance

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Management of the Former Sabiston Landfill site at Settlers Park includes condition assessment, monitoring of gas collection and environmental monitoring systems to ensure that appropriate protection is provided to abutting properties and German Mills Creek.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

Regular monitoring and maintenance of gas collection and environmental monitoring systems will reduce the risk of methane gas buildup and protect ground water quality. The quality of life for abutting residents is maintained through continuous pro-active maintenance and system upgrades.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	0	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	153,800	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	153,800	0
HST Impact:	2,707	0
Total Project Cost:	**156,500**	**0**

NOTES

This request is to retain a Consultant for a period of 2 years (2015 and 2016). Regular monitoring is required to ensure methane gas concentrations are below MOE compliance levels and German Mills Creek is not adversely affected by the leachate.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**	Consulting				**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
Operating Funded Life Cycle	156,500	156,500	0	0	0	156,500	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**156,500**					**156,500**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Former Sabiston Landfill - Monitoring**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	156,500
Amount Incl HST	156,500
Year in the study	2015

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:	$19,563
Quarter 2:	$19,563
Quarter 3:	$19,563
Quarter 4:	$19,563
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$78,250**
Year 2:	$78,250
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$156,500**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date: 12/31/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Procurement plan is not applicable as the Consultant has been retained for 2013-2015.
Inspection reports received from the Consultant.

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: Multi-phase – Subsequent Year and no change in total program cost

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

The Landfill gas collection system must be monitored and maintained in working order to ensure that the methane gas concentrations do not exceed the MOE compliance levels. The ground water within the landfill site and the German Mills Creek water quality must be monitored to ensure that they are not adversely affected by leachate. The monitoring program must be completed to MOE requirements as defined in the Certificate of Approval (C of A) for Air.

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

Severe. The City would be in violation of MOE requirements and liable for adverse conditions to abutting properties and contamination of the creek.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None.

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: $175,600

Project Name: **Streetlight Underground Cable - Condition Inspection**

Ranking: 1 Studies/Pilot Programs

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Department: Asset Mgmt - Right-of-way Assets

Project Mgr: Prathapan Kumar

Useful Life: 0

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Category: Minor

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Inspection program to verify the condition of underground streetlight cables in older areas of Markham.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

Maintaining existing assets through life cycle program in order to maintain service levels.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	0	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	172,600	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	172,600	0
HST Impact:	3,038	0
Total Project Cost:	**175,600**	**0**

NOTES

This program was initiated in 2013 to investigate the condition of underground streetlight cables in order to prepare a reliable lifecycle and an appropriate maintenance program. Consultant will carry out condition inspection/assessments of existing underground streetlight cables and recommend the required rehabilitation program. The service life of underground cable is estimated to be 40 years.
Estimated total cable length (over 40 yrs old) – 234 km
Inspected to date – 134 km
2015 inspection – 100 km
Next scheduled inspection: year 2020.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**	Inspection				**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
Operating Funded Life Cycle	175,600	175,600	0	0	0	175,600	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**175,600**					**175,600**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Streetlight Underground Cable - Condition Inspection**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	175,600
Amount Incl HST	175,600
Year in the study	2015

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:	$40,000
Quarter 2:	$87,000
Quarter 3:	$48,600
Quarter 4:	$0
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$175,600**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$175,600**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	06/01/2015
RFP/Tender Award by:	10/02/2015
Estimated Project Completion Date:	28/08/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Submission of Consultant's Report.

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.

To understand the condition of underground streetlight cables and to prepare a reliable life cycle and an appropriate maintenance program.

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

Staff will not be able to predict the future maintenance requirements. This will result in frequent cable faults and will ultimately increase the maintenance repair cost and pose danger to public safety.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

None.

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$412,000**

Project Name: **Structures Rehabilitation (4 Structures) - Design & Const.**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 25

Department: Asset Mgmt - Right-of-way Assets

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: Prathapan Kumar

Category: Major

Ward(s): CW ☐ 1 ☑ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☑ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☑ 8 ☐

Cost Validation: Multiple(specify)

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Design and construction for rehabilitation of 2 culverts (C006 and C014) and 2 pedestrian bridges (P062 and P063).

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 ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	314,900	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	90,000	0
Contingency %: 0	0	0
Sub Total:	404,900	0
HST Impact:	7,126	0
Total Project Cost:	**412,000**	**0**

NOTES

Pre-approval request for $91,600. This project includes rehabilitation works for 4 structures.
1. C006: Kirk Dr. 450m East of Yonge St.) - $81,900
2. C014: Church St 600m East of Main St Markham - $38,100
3. P062: Markham Green Golf Course Ped Bridge 1 - $146,000
4. P063 Markham Green Golf Course Ped Bridge 2 - $146,000

Refer to the attached sheet for location of these 4 structures.
Cost Validation: Recent award and external reviews.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components				
Funding Type	**Budget**	Design + CA	Construction		**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
Operating Funded Life Cycle	412,000	91,600	320,400	0 0	412,000	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**412,000**				**412,000**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Structures Rehabilitation (4 Structures) - Design & Const.**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:	412,000
Amount Incl HST	412,000
Year in the study	2015

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:	$20,000
Quarter 2:	$80,000
Quarter 3:	$150,000
Quarter 4:	$162,000
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$412,000**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$412,000**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:	1/6/2015
RFP/Tender Award by:	2/19/2015
Estimated Project Completion Date:	12/30/2016

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

100% completion of design. Completion. Completion of construction works is subject to MNR/TRCA approvals. On average, takes about 2 years to complete the works.

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.

2013/2014 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 four 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.

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$908,000**

Project Name: **Carlton Road Pumping Station Upgrade**

Ranking: 1 New Asset/Expansion

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Department: Waterworks

Useful Life: 20

Project Mgr: Paul Li

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Ward(s): CW ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☑ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐

Category: Minor

Cost Validation: Third party estimate

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Replacement of existing generator and upgrade of electrical components and pump controls including SCADA equipment for Carlton Road Pumping Station.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

To maintain the services provided to the area residents for sewage collection and reduce downtime of the existing pumping station fue to generator and other equipment failure. Will reduce possibility of sewage overflow to Toogood pond.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	785,270	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	25,907	0
Contingency %: 10	81,118	0
Sub Total:	892,295	0
HST Impact:	15,704	0
Total Project Cost:	**908,000**	**0**

NOTES

Existing emergency generator installed in 1976 (38 years old) and past twice of its service life. Controls and electrical equipment needs to be upgraded for ease of maintenance and safety. Project initially tendered early 2014 and cancelled due to high bid prices received. Adjustment in design made to reduce costs and to be retendered in October 2014 to construction in spring 2015.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**	Construction	Consultant			**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
Waterworks	908,000	879,000	29,000	0	0	908,000	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**908,000**					**908,000**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Carlton Road Pumping Station Upgrade**

DCA

Name	Year	Amount	Amount in Study

Life Cycle

Amount in Study:

Amount Incl HST

Year in the study 2015

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

$137,842 - 2015 allocation in LifeCycle. SCADA work and standardization of electrical and instrumentation controls not considered in the Lifecycle. 2016 Lifecycle study to be updated to incorporate new electrical and instrumentation requirement of all PS.

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$100,000
Quarter 2:	$650,000
Quarter 3:	$150,000
Quarter 4:	$8,000
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$908,000**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$908,000**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing: 16/10/2014

RFP/Tender Award by: 16/01/2015

Estimated Project Completion Date: 26/10/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Upgraded pumping station with new backup generator with upgraded electrical controls and SCADA instrumentation housed in a precast concrete building.

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Maintain Service Level

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

The generator has been in service since 1976. Its life expectancy is 20 years and currently almost twice its life. Generator is in very poor condition and is unrelialbe and unsafe to operate requiring immediate replacement. New equipment are needed to be installed to support the new SCADA system for remote monitoring and operation of the pumping station. This project increases the service level provided by Waterworks by having better control and monitoring of the pumping station. Regular maintenance and emergency respons will result in this upgrade project.

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

Inability to provide emergency power to the pumping station in case of prolong power failure and unreliable operation of the generator. Should the generator fail, it is beyond repair as it is not service anymore by third parties due to obsolescense. Inability to have a backup power would result in sewage overflow of the pumping station to the Toogood pond.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

Major bilding housing the SCADA and other electrical controls have been found to be too costly. A feasible cost alternative was found by using a pre-fab building to house the SCADA and other PS controls for safety and ease of maintenance as well as protection from external vandalism.

2015 PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST FORM

Number:

Project Cost: **$555,300**

Project Name: **Water Meter Replacement/Upgrade Program**

Ranking: 1 Repair/Replace

Commission: Community & Fire Services

Useful Life: 20

Department: Waterworks

Council Request: ☐ Pre Approval: ☑

Project Mgr: David Huynh & Mario Roque

Category: Annual

Ward(s): CW ☑ 1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐ 5☐ 6☐ 7☐ 8☐

Cost Validation: Recent awards

Requirement Validation: Condition assessment

DETAILED DESCRIPTION (SCOPE OF PROJECT):

Replacement of residential and ICI water meters that reached their life expectancy. Testing, repairs & replacement of ICI meters based on consumption and accuracy payback to reduce non-revenue water loss.

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

Primary Objective: Municipal Services

Supports economic vitality by providing a well maintained, upgraded and renewed water system. Promotes water conservation through accurate measurement of water consumption. Promotes environmental helath through prevention of water damage inside premises caused by leaking water meter.

PROJECT COSTS ($)

	2015	Future Phases
Cost/Quote:	519,740	0
Internal Charges:	0	0
External Consulting:	0	0
Contingency %: 5	25,987	0
Sub Total:	545,727	0
HST Impact:	9,605	0
Total Project Cost:	**555,300**	**0**

NOTES

3 year average is $483,146. Industry and AWWA water meter life expectancy 20 years. Replaced meters are tested for variation in accuracy to determine optimum life expectancy and adjustment of life cycle. Budget is for est. 2380 residential @$173/m and 36 ICI at $3000/m replacement. High resolution registers E-coders used for compatibility with future AMI technology. Supported under Water System Lifecycle Reserves funding. New approved contract starting Feb. 2015 provides 3 years fixed price and 2 yrs CPI index increase.

PROPOSED SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING ($)

		Components					
Funding Type	**Budget**	Residential	ICI			**TOTAL**	**Future Phases**
Waterworks	555,300	439,936	115,396	0	0	555,332	0
TOTAL FUNDING	**555,300**					**555,332**	**0**

OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT

Personnel	Non Personnel	Revenues	Expenditures/(Revenues)
$0	$0	$0	$0

Project Name: **Water Meter Replacement/Upgrade Program**

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

$520,200 - 2015 allocation in Lifecycle. Increase numbers in residential replacements due to enforcement of Water Meter By-law. ICI meters replacement increase resulting from increase testing.

Cash Flow Estimates:

Quarter 1:	$80,000
Quarter 2:	$150,000
Quarter 3:	$200,000
Quarter 4:	$125,300
Year 1 Total Cash Flow:	**$555,300**
Year 2:	$0
Year 3 + beyond:	$0
Total All Years:	**$555,300**

Procurement Plan:

RFP/Tender Submission to Purchasing:

RFP/Tender Award by:

Estimated Project Completion Date: 31/12/2015

Estimated 2015 Deliverables

Purchasing involvement not required - Purchase Order awarded in 2014. 5 years contract starting Feb. 2015 with 3 years fixed prices and 2 years CPI index increase. RFP #022-R-14.

Business Case - Rationale for project submission

i) Project Class: New Project – Maintain Service Level

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

To replace water meters that have reached their life expectancy to reduce non-revenue water loss, reduce maintenance cost as well as reduce customer service complaints and billing disputes and reduce liabiltities due to leaking meters.

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

Non recovery of non-revenue water loss, increase maintenance cost and increase customer service complaints. May include private property damage liability due to leaking meter.

iv) What alternatives were considered?

Non-replacements would not cost anything but will result in unknown water revenue loss, increase cost of maintenance, and poor customer service.