



Report to: General Committee

Report Date: November 1, 2013

---

**SUBJECT:** Staff Awarded Contracts for the Month of October 2013  
**PREPARED BY:** Alex Moore, Ext. 4711

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. THAT the report entitled "Staff Awarded Contracts for the Month of October 2013" be received;
2. And that Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution

**PURPOSE:**

To inform Council of Staff Awarded Contracts >\$50,000 for the month of October 2013 as per Purchasing By-law 2004-341.

**BACKGROUND:**

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

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

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

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

**Community & Fire Services**

Award Details	Description
Lowest Priced Supplier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 197-T-13 Accessible Pedestrian Signal Installations and Associated Civil Works</li><li>• 232-T-13 Replacement of the Roof Fire Station #95 and Craft Guild Canopy</li><li>• 168-Q-13 Remove and Replace Retaining Walls</li><li>• 229-T-13 Fall Ash Tree Removal</li><li>• 233-T-13 Markham Playground Equipment Replacement Program 2013</li><li>• 227-T-13 Tree Planting Services</li><li>• 236-T-13 Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) Wood Waste Removal Program</li></ul>
Sole Bidder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 219-Q-13 Recycling Collection and Marketing</li></ul>

**Development Services**

Award Details	Description
Lowest Priced Supplier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 176-T-13 Rehabilitation of Storm Water System Maintenance – Trenchless &amp; Open Cut Repairs)</li><li>• 274-Q-13 Water Service and Sanitary Sewer Connections at Various Locations</li></ul>

12/11/2013

X 

Joel Lustig  
Treasurer

15/11/2013

X 

Trinela Cane  
Commissioner, Corporate Services



## STAFF AWARD REPORT

Page 1 of 2

To:	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer
Re:	197-T-13 Accessible Pedestrian Signal Installations and Associated Civil Works
Date:	September 12, 2013
Prepared by:	Ravali Kosaraju, Engineering Technologist, ext. 2608 Michelle Zhu, Senior Buyer / Analyst, ext. 2025

### PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for the installation of accessible pedestrian signals at nine (9) City intersections.

### RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	Stacey Electric Company Limited (Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 64,851.82	061-5350-13472-005 Pedestrian Accessibility Improvement- Ph 3 of 6
Less cost of award	\$ 330,235.42	Inclusive of HST*
	\$ 33,023.54	Contingency Inclusive of HST (10%)
	\$ 363,258.96	Total Award
Budget remaining after this award	\$ 1,592.86	**

\*Actual cost of award is based on installation of accessible pedestrian signals at nine (9) City intersections instead of ten (10) intersections included in the tender.

\*\*The remaining budget will be returned to the original funding source.

### BACKGROUND

This is the third of a six-year annual program in the citywide installation of accessible pedestrian signals. In the initial work plan, 59 intersections were identified for pedestrian accessibility improvements. However, six (6) of these intersections are undergoing or have undergone intersection improvements through projects overseen by the Capital Works and Engineering departments. Including the intersections identified in this year's project, Operations department will have completed pedestrian accessibility improvements at 29 intersections. Pedestrian accessibility improvements at the remaining 25 intersections (1 additional intersection added after the initial work plan was submitted in 2010) will be carried out as follows:

- Nine (9) intersections listed for year four (2014);
- Nine (9) intersections listed for year five (2015); and
- Seven (7) intersections listed for year six (2016).

A component of this project includes zebra pavement markings for all crosswalks to enhance the pedestrian crossings at signalized intersections to meet the accessibility standards and guidelines specified by Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) and the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). In addition, new pedestrian signals, new underground ducts/wiring, new poles or pole upgrades, curb ramping, and crosswalks will also be installed at the nine (9) signalized intersections.

**BACKGROUND (Continued)**

The project involves installation of accessible pedestrian signals at the following nine (9) City intersections:

- Rodick Road at Apple Creek Boulevard;
- Rodick Road at Calvert Road;
- Enterprise Boulevard at Ravis Road;
- Enterprise Boulevard at Main Street Unionville;
- Denison Street at Gorvette Road - Milliken Meadows Drive;
- Denison Street at Old Kennedy Road - Fresno Court;
- Denison Street at Featherstone Avenue;
- Denison Street at Middlefield Road; and
- Middlefield Road at Highglen Avenue.

**BID INFORMATION**

Advertised	ETN
Bids closed on	September 5, 2013
Number picking up bid documents	7
Number responding to bid	3

**PRICE SUMMARY (Inclusive of HST)**

Suppliers	Price *	Price **
Stacey Electric Co. Ltd.	\$383,725.97*	\$330,235.42
Guild Electric Limited	\$451,101.89	\$387,792.40
Beacon Utility Contractors Limited	\$575,635.87	\$488,001.02

\*Bid opening price for 10 intersections

\*\* Price for 9 intersections (recommended for award)

The unit prices from this year's project are comparable to the 2012 project for Pedestrian Accessibility excluding durable pavement markings. Durable pavement markings were part of the 2013 budget scope and are considered safer due to the longevity and the minimal maintenance required and is considered the City's new standard. The durable pavement markings resulted in an additional cost of \$30,643.07 inclusive of HST for 2,796 metres (when comparing to the 2012 award).

The 2013 budget was built based on installation of ten accessible pedestrian signals including the use of durable pavement markings for zebra crossings. Tender results were higher than budget due to increase in item quantities resulting from larger intersection profiles. Staff recommends one of the ten accessible pedestrian signal installation be deferred to 2015 as the pedestrian activity at this intersection is not significant and all the minimum required pedestrian safety features are currently installed. Staff is of the opinion that deferring the installation of accessible pedestrian signals at this location to 2015 will not impact service levels and will not extend the duration of the six year program to upgrade the pedestrian facilities at all of the Cities' intersections. The 2014 budget amount takes into account the increased cost per intersection based on this award's pricing.



## STAFF AWARD REPORT

Page 1 of 2

To:	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer
Re:	232-T-13 Replacement of the Roof Fire Station #95 and Craft Guild Canopy
Date:	September 11, 2013
Prepared by:	Max Stanford, Project Manager, ext. 2710 Robert Slater, Senior Construction Buyer, ext. 3189

### PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for the replacement of the roof of Fire Station #95 (Main Street Unionville) and the Craft Guild Canopy.

### RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	T. Hamilton & Son Roofing Inc. (Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 86,200.00	750-101-5399-13313 (Roof Replacement Projects)
Less cost of award	\$ 132,277.82	Cost of Award
	\$ 13,227.78	Contingency – 10%
	\$ 145,505.60	Total Project Cost (Inclusive of HST)
Budget Remaining after this award	\$ (\$59,305.60)	*

\* The shortfall of (\$59,305.60) inclusive of HST will be funded from roofing projects that will be deferred within project #13313.

Note: The new Fire Station roof will have a useful life of 25 years versus the 15 years of the existing roof.

### BACKGROUND:

The replacement of these roofs were identified in the annual life cycle review. Funds were allocated in the 2013 Project Funding Request number 13313.

The Fire Station roof was replaced in 1999 and has not lived up to its expected life for a Built Up Roof system. The drainage on the roof is poor and an additional roof drain is being added. The poor drainage could be a contributing factor to the previous system's poor performance. The roof design is also being upgraded to a Modified Bitumen Roof. This roof presently has a moderate leak into the apparatus bay. The leak is in an area of low concern and has not been corrected yet in anticipation of the upcoming roof replacement.

The Craft Guild roof replacement is on the small front canopy. This roof is in very poor condition.

### BUSINESS CASE

The life expectancy for a Modified Bitumen roofing system is 25 years and far outlasts that of a Built Up Roof system, on which original estimates were based, which is 15 years at best. The longer life span is almost entirely offset by the higher cost with a marginal advantage to the Modified Bitumen Roof, however, other non-financial considerations apply as follows:

1. A Modified Bitumen Roof does not require a loose or partially embedded gravel surfacing so inspection is efficient and leaks are easier, and less costly, to find and repair.
2. The building design industry is moving towards higher performing roofs systems such as Modified Bitumen Roof for sensitive facilities given its longer life span in addition to its ease of repair.
3. The Fire Station # 95 and the Craft Guild Canopy are already leaking and Asset Management recommends proceeding with the award to replace the roof now while there is some good weather remaining this year.

**BUSINESS CASE (Continued)**

4. One of the causes of the early demise of the Built up Roof system at Fire Station #95 is the ponding of water which this project will correct with the installation of an additional drain.
5. Built up Roof systems decay faster, in part, because the gravel ballast collects water which in turn collects dust. As the dust and water settles for extended periods of time in the gravel it increases the rate of decay of the waterproofing bitumen's in the assembly. The Modified Bitumen roof does not have any gravel surfacing so it eliminates the opportunity for collection of material to decay the roof. It also relies on much higher quality rubberized bitumen which is more resistant to degradation over time.
6. City properties are normally held for a long term and usage warrants a high quality, long-lived building envelope and therefore roofing specifications tend to higher performing types of assemblies where justifiable.
7. Asset Management evaluated the applicability and relative costs of various replacement roofing systems when specifying these roofs and opted to optimize performance and maximize life expectancy while remaining cost neutral over the lifecycle.

**BID INFORMATION**

Advertised	ETN
Bids closed on	August 29, 2013
Number picking up bid documents	9
Number responding to bid	7

**DETAILED PRICING INFORMATION**

Suppliers	Prices (inclusive of HST)
<b>T. Hamilton &amp; Sons Roofing Inc.</b>	<b>\$ 132,277.82</b>
ASeal Roofing and Sheet Metal Ltd,	\$ 152,131.20
Kast-Con Development Inc.	\$ 169,939.20
Nortex Roofing Ltd.	\$ 172,483.20
Proteck Roofing	\$ 181,641.60
Crawford Roofing Corp.	\$ 218,275.20
Trinity Roofing Ltd.	\$ 245,089.98

The bids have been verified for accuracy and compliance with the Request for Proposal Terms and Conditions. Purchasing has reviewed the references of the recommended supplier and is satisfied with these recommendations.



## STAFF AWARD REPORT

Page 1 of 2

To:	Brenda J. Librecz, Commissioner, Community & Fire Services
Re:	168-Q-13 Remove and Replace Retaining Walls
Date:	October 7, 2013
Prepared by:	John Hoover, Supervisor, Contract Administration, ext. 4808 Patti Malone, Senior Buyer, ext. 2239

### PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for the removal and replacement of retaining walls at four (4) locations within the City of Markham.

### RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	MPS Property Services (Lowest Priced Supplier - Augusta Court) Dig-Con International (Lowest Priced Supplier - Robinson/Water) Speedside Construction Limited (Lowest Priced Supplier - Raymerville/Bendamere) Sheffield Contracting (Lowest Priced Supplier - Robinson/Homestead)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 72,700.00	050-6150-13458-005 Retaining Walls Program Budget allocated for this purchase
Less cost of award	\$ 66,381.51 \$ 6,318.49 \$ 72,700.00	Inclusive of HST Contingency (9.5%) Total Cost of Award
Budget Remaining after this award	\$ 0.00	

Actual cost of award is based on the replacement four (4) retaining walls instead of six (6) retaining walls included in the tender.

### BACKGROUND

The quotation was issued for the removal of existing concrete retaining walls and the installation of a new retaining in the same location. The four (4) locations are the following;

- Augusta Court
- Robinson/Water
- Raymerville/Bendamere
- Robinson/Homestead

These four locations have exceeded their life cycle of 20 years and condition assessments confirmed that these retaining walls are in need of replacement.

The work will commence following contract award and will be completed by December 3, 2013.

### OPTIONS/ DISCUSSION

Staff have reviewed all locations and recommends deferring the retaining wall replacements at Raymerville/Byer, and Walkerville/Cornell Park as these are lower in height and pose minimal risk to pedestrian safety. These locations will be part of the 2014 Retaining Wall Program, which will be tendered in early spring 2014.

### BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN
Bids closed on	August 21, 2013
Number picking up bid documents	28
Number responding to bid	14

## DETAILED PRICING INFORMATION (Inclusive of HST)

Suppliers	LOCATIONS			
	Augusta Court	Robinson/Water	Raymerville/Bendamere	Robinson/Homestead
<b>Speedside Construction Limited</b>	\$7,794.82	\$6,410.88	<b>\$14,653.44</b>	\$50,880.00
<b>Sheffield Contracting</b>	\$11,782.12	\$9,078.60	\$19,678.08	<b>\$38,532.13</b>
<b>MPS Property Services</b>	<b>\$6,599.14</b>	\$8,619.07	\$15,202.94	\$67,131.07
Griffith Property Services Ltd.	\$7,428.48	\$6,614.40	\$20,034.00	\$60,852.48
ARC General Contracting	\$8,518.31	\$11,800.24	\$22,187.57	\$46,073.77
MTM Landscaping	\$6,919.68	\$9,158.40	\$24,982.08	\$61,808.01
Markham Landscaping Nurseries Ltd.	\$8,507.14	\$11,465.30	\$18,545.76	\$48,103.99
Vertical Horizons Contracting	\$7,937.28	\$5,678.21	\$20,415.60	\$79,702.50
Land-Con Ltd.	\$9,097.34	\$13,289.86	\$23,318.30	\$67,424.14
<b>Dig-Con International</b>	\$7,275.84	<b>\$5,596.80</b>	\$22,387.20	\$85,071.36
Tower Restoration Ltd.	\$11,193.60	\$9,158.40	\$28,492.80	\$96,672.00
Canada Construction Limited	\$17,095.68	\$16,078.08	\$29,917.44	\$77,337.60
Hawkins Contracting Services Limited	\$13,635.84	\$14,424.48	\$35,514.24	\$102,726.72
Pops Restoration	\$11,244.48	\$20,504.64	\$22,896.00	\$105,525.12

The budget was based on an average cost per linear meter of retaining wall replacement based on historicals. The Bid price came in higher than expected due primarily to higher than anticipated unit rates for the retaining walls at Augusta Court as it is built on top of a hill and will require more work to transport equipment to the site as well as higher than average retaining walls at Raymerville/Bendamere and Robinson/Homestead.





### STAFF AWARD REPORT

To:	Brenda J. Librecz, Commissioner, Community & Fire Services
Re:	229-T-13 Fall Ash Tree Removal
Date:	October 9, 2013
Prepared by:	Jeff McMann, Forestry Supervisor, ext. 2335 Patti Malone, Senior Buyer, ext. 2239

### PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for the fall ash tree removal.

### RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier (s)	Wilderness Environmental Services (Lowest Priced Supplier/Item #1) ShadyLane Expert Tree Care Inc. (Lowest Priced Supplier/Item #2, #4 & #6) Uxbridge Tree Service Inc. (Lowest Priced Supplier/ Item #3) Advanced Tree Care Inc. (Lowest Priced Supplier/Item #7) WM Weller Tree Service Ltd.(Lowest Priced Supplier/Item #5)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 475,000.00	700-101-5399-13438 Emerald Ash Borer Program
Less cost of award	\$ 152,633.58	Inclusive of HST
Budget Remaining after this award	\$ 322,366.42	*

\* The remaining budget to be used for Emerald Ash Borer Program, including planting, tree supply and stumping.

Note: Budget was estimated at \$250/tree removal, staff received favourable pricing of an average cost of \$80/tree removal.

### BACKGROUND

The Emerald Ash Borer has been an introduced pest causing major devastation to the ash tree population of Canada. It is expected that approximately 16,000+ trees will need to be removed from the boulevards and manicured park areas within the City of Markham. The surveying process has produced a list of approximately 1,900 trees that require removal this Fall of 2013. This tendered list represents the first major removal phase of the 5 year program. The sectioning of work into geographical areas has proved to be beneficial for all parties involved as indicated by the pricing as detailed below. Once the trees are removed, the contractors will transport them to the Miller yard wherein a separate contractor will remove the wood bi-product.

### BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN
Bids closed on	September 10, 2013
Number picking up bid documents	18
Number responding to bid	8

### DETAILED PRICING INFORMATION (INCLUSIVE OF HST)

Suppliers	Area #						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Forest Glenn Tree Care Inc.	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	No bid	\$14,018.46
ShadyLane Expert Tree Care Inc.	\$33,136.26	<b>\$31,032.12</b>	\$29,196.03	<b>\$19,167.86</b>	\$29,648.18	<b>\$11,881.65</b>	\$7,367.10
Uxbridge Tree Service Inc.	\$40,424.16	\$53,548.15	<b>\$27,441.62</b>	\$59,798.25	\$26,626.52	\$25,268.03	\$10,143.44
Advanced Tree Care Inc.	\$55,893.91	\$40,374.01	\$74,607.29	\$44,809.06	\$40,218.01	\$15,163.65	<b>\$6,838.27</b>
Wilderness Environmental Services	<b>\$30,468.27</b>	\$35,277.26	\$33,469.53	\$33,976.93	\$27,667.65	\$29,438.67	\$9,084.64
Darlington Property Maintenance	\$31,992.84	\$41,935.30	\$38,695.77	\$47,370.30	\$44,876.16	\$46,135.44	\$11,682.05
WM Weller Tree Service Ltd.	\$35,342.27	\$34,032.11		\$37,554.02	<b>\$25,803.79</b>	\$18,383.20	\$7,379.64
Ontree	\$70,875.84	\$57,189.12	\$56,629.44	\$87,564.48	\$70,646.88	\$32,207.04	\$13,228.80

**STAFF AWARD REPORT****Page 1 of 2**

To:	Brenda Librecz, Commissioner, Community & Fire Services
Re:	233-T-13, Markham Playground Equipment Replacement Program 2013
Date:	October 21, 2013
Prepared by:	Doug Henderson, Supervisor, Parks Operations, ext. 7997 Michelle Zhu, Senior Buyer / Analyst, ext. 2025

**PURPOSE**

To obtain approval to award the Contract for Markham Playground Equipment Replacement Program at Calvert Park, Leighland Park and Roughaven Park.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Recommended Supplier (s)	Mopal Construction Ltd. (Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 485,241.57	059-6150-13420-005 Play structure & Safety Surface
Less cost of award	\$ 151,520.60	Inclusive of HST
Budget Remaining after this award	\$ 331,444.45	*

\* The remaining balance of \$331,444.45 will be returned to the original funding source. Proctor Park playground equipment was budgeted for replacement under this project, and has been deferred due to the Urban Design department's park revitalization study. Furthermore, other components within this budget came in under-budget, which contributed to the balance remaining.

**BACKGROUND**

The existing playground and rubberized safety surface at Coppard Park and Denison Park, were installed prior to the development of the CAN/CSA-Z614 "Children's Playspaces and Equipment" guidelines in 1998. This contract is to supply and install new playground equipments at Calvert Park, Leighland Park and Roughaven Park in order to become compliant with CSA-Z614-07. The playgrounds were last replaced in 1997 and all four playgrounds are past their life cycle of 15 years.

The Calvert Park site is located adjacent to Calvert Rd. and Macrill Rd. on the north-west corner. The nearest major intersection is Warden Ave. and Sixteenth Ave. There is one existing curbed playground with a granite sand safety surface containing one combined senior unit, one combined junior unit, one double swing bay and one spring toy.

The Leighland Park site is located adjacent to Leighland Dr. on the south side. The nearest major intersection is Rodick Rd. and Sixteenth Ave. There is one existing playground pit with a concrete sand safety surface containing one combined senior unit, one combined junior unit and one single swing bay.

The Roughaven Park site is located adjacent to Schouten Cres. and Charlotte Angliss Rd. on the west side of Schouten res. The nearest major intersection is Markham Rd. and Highway 407. There are two exiting playground pits with concrete sand safety surfaces containing one combined senior unit and one overhead event with sitting area, and one double swing bay.

The work is scheduled to be completed by November 29, 2013.

**BID INFORMATION**

Advertised	ETN
Bids closed on	August 29, 2013
Number picking up bid documents	16
Number responding to bid	3

**PRICE SUMMARY (Inclusive of HST)**

<b>Suppliers</b>	<b>Bid Price (4 Parks)*</b>	<b>Bid Price (3 Parks)**</b>
<b>Mopal Construction Ltd.</b>	<b>\$211,660.80</b>	<b>\$151,520.60</b>
1748318 Ontario Inc. o/a Advanced Landscapes	\$217,235.58	\$153,797.12
Hawkins Contracting Services Ltd.	\$237,271.76	\$175,458.66

\*The bid price included all four (4) parks, Calvert Park, Leighland Park, Proctor Park and Rougehaven Park.

\*\* This price removes Proctor Park as the Urban Design department has an ongoing park revitalization study and has identified Proctor Park for future re-purposing. As such, Proctor Park was removed as allowed by the City's General Terms and Conditions.

**FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The costs per park range from \$29,846.51 to \$65,360.13 inclusive of HST impact. The average cost per park is \$49,633.33 inclusive of HST, which is 2.64% less than that of previous contract 154-T-10 where three parks had similar scope of work.



## STAFF AWARD REPORT

Page 1 of 2

To:	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer
Re:	227-T-13 Tree Planting Services
Date:	October 15, 2013
Prepared by:	Jeff McMann, Supervisor, Forestry, ext. 2335 Patti Malone, Senior Buyer, ext. 2239

### PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for tree planting services for a one (1) year plus two (2) year option at the same itemized pricing.

### RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	Lomco Landscape Contractors (Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 297,600.00	Budget estimated for purchase - See Financials
Less cost of award	\$ 297,582.00 \$ 339,358.00 <u>\$ 339,358.00</u> \$ 976,298.00	Fall 2013 to Spring 2014 estimate of 2,543 trees, HST inclusive Fall 2014 to Spring 2015 estimate of 2,900 trees, HST inclusive * Fall 2015 to Spring 2016 estimate of 2,900 trees, HST inclusive *
Budget Remaining after this award**	\$ 18.00	**

\*Subject to Council approval of the 2014 and 2015 budget.

\*\* Budget remaining to be returned to the funding source.

### BACKGROUND

This contract is for planting of trees to replace dead/diseased/damaged trees on boulevards which are part of the annual tree replacement program and for the EAB program. The trees are supplied by the City and will be typically 60mm. caliper nursery stock, string ball and/or in wire basket, held at the City nursery. Staff estimated that 2,900 trees will need to be planted based on 900 boulevard/park trees replacements, from historical average plus growth and removal of 2,000 ash trees as part of the EAB program. At the time of tender, Staff had estimated that 800 trees were going to be planted in Fall 2013 and 2,100 in Spring 2014. As a result of the increased unit pricing received from Bidders and recent Fall 2013 tree supply award, Staff assessed and determined that the Fall requirement can be reduced to 500 and the Spring planting adjusted to 2,043 (for a revised estimate of 2,543 for Fall 2013/ Spring 2014 contract). The number of plantings in Spring 2014 may change based on future tree assessment through the annual boulevard/parks tree replacement and EAB program. Should additional tree plantings be required above and beyond the estimates provided in this award, Staff will seek appropriate authority for a purchase order increase as per the Expenditure Control Policy. For the future years of the contract, Staff estimate the requirement to replace 2,900 trees due to increased tree mortality from EAB and will allocate sufficient budget based on the higher unit prices.

### BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN (Electronic Tendering Network)
Bids closed on	September 12, 2013
Number picking up bid documents	5
Number responding to bid	2

\* Of the bidders that picked up the bid document but did not submit a bid; one (1) bidder identified they were too busy, and one bidder indicated that they could not handle this volume and the remaining bidder did not respond to the City.

**PRICE SUMMARY (including HST Impact)**

Suppliers	Qty*	Unit Price**	Extended Price
Lomco Landscape Contractors	2900	\$117.02	\$339,369.60
Cedar Springs Landscape Group Ltd.	2900	\$145.00	\$420,500.00

\*To maintain budget, the estimated number of trees plantings will be reduced from 2900 to 2,543.

\*\* Compared to the previous (2013) contract, this contract represents an increase of 21%. Staff believe the price increase is driven by the EAB work across all municipalities, causing the number of available suppliers to decrease and demand to increase. Note: Staff reviewed the previous four tenders for tree planting services to better understand the trending to validate some of this information.

The following chart shows the history for purchasing tree planting services at the City.

Year	2009	2010	2012	2013
Low Bid unit price	\$68.18	\$83.95	\$96.67	\$117.02
# of Bidders picking up document	34	13	4	5
# of Bidders responding	14	6	4	2
# of Bids with units cost <\$115/tree plus HST	5	2	1	1

Additionally, staff compared pricing with two other municipalities who recently closed their tender, one municipality only received two bids and was 49% over budget and the other municipality awarded to their low bidder a unit cost of \$128 per tree.

**FINANCIAL ATTACHMENT**

Account Name	Account #	Budget Amount	Budget Estimate for Purchase	Cost of Award	Budget Remaining
Replacement/New of Boulevard/ Parks Trees	700-101-5399-13434	97,600	97,600	97,595	5
Emerald Ash Borer Project – Year 1 of 5	700-101-5399-13438	2,066,300	200,000	199,987	13
<b>Totals:</b>		<b>2,163,900</b>	<b>297,600</b>	<b>297,582</b>	<b>18</b>



### STAFF AWARD REPORT

To:	Brenda J. Librecz, Commissioner, Community & Fire Services
Re:	236-T-13 Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) Wood Waste Removal Program
Date:	October 28, 2013
Prepared by:	Jeff McMann, Forestry Supervisor, ext. 2335 Patti Malone, Senior Buyer, ext. 2239

### PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for the emerald ash borer (EAB) wood waste removal program for one (1) year with the option to renew for an additional four (4) years at the same 2013 itemized pricing.

### RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier (s)	Gro-Bark (Ontario) Ltd. (Lowest Priced Supplier)	
Current Budget Available	\$300,000.00	700-101-5399-13438 Emerald Ash Borer Program
Less cost of award	\$ 15,264.00	2013 - 1 <sup>st</sup> Year, Inclusive of HST
	\$ 15,264.00	2014 - 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year, Inclusive of HST*
	\$ 15,264.00	2015 - 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year, Inclusive of HST*
	\$ 15,264.00	2016 - 4 <sup>th</sup> Year, Inclusive of HST*
	\$ 15,264.00	2017 - 5 <sup>th</sup> Year, Inclusive of HST*
	\$ 76,320.00	Total Award
Budget Remaining after this award	\$284,736.00	Budget Remaining after this award**

\* Subject to Council approval of the annual 2014 to 2017 budgets.

\*\*The remaining balance is committed to the Emerald Ash Borer program including consultants, tree removals, stumping and planting.

Note: Budget was estimated at \$75/cubic metres, staff received favourable pricing of an average cost of \$3.80/cubic metres.

### BACKGROUND

The removal of ash trees generates wood chips from the chipping process in which the branches and pieces of wood smaller than 25 cm in diameter are made smaller. The pieces of wood that are larger than 25 cm, are cut into lengths to be set aside at a collection site. The potential removal of over 16,000 ash trees will produce a substantial volume of wood chips and wood that needs to be processed. This involves a contractor removing the chips and wood from a designated storage area. The contractor will adhere to all applicable regulations.

### BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN
Bids closed on	August 29, 2013
Number picking up bid documents	9
Number responding to bid	5

### PRICE SUMMARY (INCLUSIVE OF HST)

Suppliers	Wood Chips	Log/Trunk Wood	Total Award
Gro-Bark (Ontario) Ltd.	\$11,193.60	\$4,070.40	\$15,264.00
PMG EcoSolutions	\$24,218.88	\$6,054.72	\$30,273.60
A J Family Inc.	No Bid	\$4,833.60	Incomplete
General Biofuel Inc.	\$81,408.00	\$20,352.00	\$101,760.00
Miller Waste System Inc.	\$65,004.29	\$13,839.36	\$78,843.65



# STAFF AWARD REPORT

Page 1 of 2

To:	Brenda Librecz, Commissioner, Fire and Community Services
Re:	219-Q-13, Recycling Collection and Marketing
Date:	October 17, 2013
Prepared by:	Claudia Marsales Senior Manager Waste & Environment ext. 3560

## PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for Recycling Collection and Marketing for four (4) years at the same 2013 itemized pricing.

## RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier (s)	The Recycle People (Sole Bidder)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 18,375.00	Various accounts (See financial considerations)
Less cost of award	\$ 17,478.11	Oct 31 <sup>st</sup> – December 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2013
	\$ 59,924.95	Jan 1 <sup>st</sup> – December 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2014*
	\$ 59,924.95	Jan 1 <sup>st</sup> – December 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2015*
	\$ 59,924.95	Jan 1 <sup>st</sup> – December 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2016*
	\$ 42,446.84	Jan 1 <sup>st</sup> – October 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2017*
	\$239,699.80	Total award (Inclusive of HST)
Budget Remaining after this award	\$ 896.89	*

\* Subject to Council approval of the annual 2014-2017 operating budgets.

\*\*Remaining budget will be used to offset other depot operating expenses.

## BACKGROUND

Markham's current contract with *The Recycle People* for the collection and marketing of plastic film from Markham's four Community Recycling Depots, the Civic Centre and 8100 Warden Ave. expired on September 16, 2013. Markham went to the marketplace to obtain bids for the collection and marketing of plastic film, plus additional materials including print/toner cartridges, polystyrene, tires, and batteries. Currently polystyrene and tires are being collected by Miller Waste Systems who did not bid on this contract. The Recycle People have been Markham's depot/facility collection contractor since 2009 and Staff have been very satisfied with their performance.

## BID INFORMATION

Advertised	ETN (Electronic Tendering Network)
Bids closed on	October 8, 2013
Number picking up bid documents	7
Number responding to bid	1*

Staff contacted the suppliers that picked up the Bid document but did not submit. Of the six responses, four advised they did not do hazardous waste collection (i.e. battery) and the volume of work does not allow them to set up special arrangements, two advised they are too far from Markham to perform the work in the volume specified.

Supplier	Bid Price (Inclusive of HST)
The Recycle People	\$ 59,924.95

Note: Due to the sole bid scenario, Staff assessed the pricing provided and can confirm the pricing submitted under this quotation is very competitive in comparison to other contracts. Markham's residential waste collection firm used to do these pick-ups on an hourly basis of \$54.25/hour plus fuel, the rate under this contract is a flat rate of \$49.25 - \$52.95 per pick up (no hourly rate charge and no fuel costs).

#### FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Account Name	Account #	Budget Amount	Budget Allocated to this Award	Cost of Award	Budget Remaining
<b>2013 Budget</b>					
Markham Depot - Recycling Service	770-470-5912	27,850.00	802.08	762.93	39.15
Unionville Depot - Recycling Service	770-471-5912	25,692.00	802.08	762.93	39.15
Milliken Depot - Recycling Service	770-472-5912	24,699.00	802.08	762.93	39.15
Thornhill Depot - Recycling Service	770-473-5912	30,443.00	802.08	762.93	39.15
Recycling Service	770-772-5912	104,193.00	15,166.67	14,426.38	740.29
<b>Totals:</b>		<b>212,877.00</b>	<b>18,375.00</b>	<b>17,478.11</b>	<b>896.89</b>
<b>2014 Proposed Budget</b>					
Markham Depot - Recycling Service	770-470-5912	27,850.00	1,947.92	1,852.84	95.08
Unionville Depot - Recycling Service	770-471-5912	25,692.00	1,947.92	1,852.84	95.08
Milliken Depot - Recycling Service	770-472-5912	24,699.00	1,947.92	1,852.84	95.08
Thornhill Depot - Recycling Service	770-473-5912	30,443.00	1,947.92	1,852.84	95.08
Recycling Service	770-772-5912	104,193.00	36,833.33	35,035.49	1,797.85
<b>Totals:</b>		<b>212,877.00</b>	<b>44,625.00</b>	<b>42,446.84</b>	<b>2,178.16</b>
<b>Totals:</b>		<b>425,754.00</b>	<b>63,000.00</b>	<b>59,924.95</b>	<b>3,075.05</b>

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The recycling of plastic bags and other materials not collected in the blue box system contribute towards achieving Markham's 80% diversion target and Zero Waste goals.





## STAFF AWARD REPORT

Page 1 of 2

To:	Andy Taylor, Chief Administrative Officer
Re:	176-T-13 Rehabilitation of Storm Water System Maintenance – Trenchless & Open Cut Repairs
Date:	September 12, 2013
Prepared by:	Philip Zhang, Engineering Design Assistant, ext. 2477 Alain Cachola, Senior Manager of Infrastructure and Capital Projects, ext 2711 Robert Slater, Senior Construction Buyer, ext. 3189

### PURPOSE

To obtain approval to award the contract for storm sewer repairs at different locations within Markham.

### RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Supplier	PipeFlo Contracting Corp. (Lowest Priced Supplier for Parts 1, 2 and 4)	
Current Budget Available	\$ 296,247.00	058-5350-12302-005
	<u>\$ 354,609.00</u>	058-5350-11335-005
	\$ 650,856.00	Total
Less cost of award	\$ 472,166.40	Bid Price Part 1, 2 and 4
	<u>\$ 47,216.64</u>	Contingency – 10%
	\$ 519,383.04	Total Cost of Award (Inclusive of HST)
	<u>\$ 46,744.47</u>	Engineering Department Internal Management Fee (9%)
	\$ 566,127.51	Total Project Cost
Budget Remaining after this award	\$ 84,728.49	

\* The remaining balance of \$84,728.49 will remain in the account to be used for the future storm sewer repairs.

### BACKGROUND

In 2011, Operations Department completed a CCTV investigation program on the storm sewers within the City's boundaries. From these investigations, approximately one hundred (100) locations of storm sewer pipe were identified as being in a state of severe disrepair and need to be repaired as soon as possible. Operations transferred the project to Engineering Department to tender and provide contract administration for the construction. Due to various circumstances such as concrete obstructions, protruding metal, corrugated steel pipes (CSP) and severe structural failure in the pipe, an expected ten (10) sections of the storm sewer will need to be repaired using an Open Cut Method. The remaining recommended sewer repairs are to be completed using either a Trenchless Method or Man Entry in order to minimize restoration costs and disruption to the local residents.

The project work areas include various sections and diameters of the storm water collection system in several locations within the City. The work consists of, but not limited to the following tasks:

- CCTV inspection (pre-installation and post-rehabilitation) for sewers
- Sewer flow control
- Sewer Lining, including liner design parameters and pipe insertion
- Sewer Pipe Joint Sealing, Patching, and Grouting
- Lateral sewer sealing at mainline sewer
- Sewer pipe section sealing
- Sewer cleaning and flushing
- Reinstatement of disturbed areas
- Locates for intruding utilities
- By-pass pumping (if required)
- Reaming including cutting and removal of roots
- Public Notification

**BID INFORMATION**

Advertised	ETN
Bids closed on	August 1, 2013
Number picking up bid documents	3
Number responding to bid	2

Due to the low number of companies picking up the RFT document, staff contacted other companies that do this or similar work to understand why they did not bid. Reasons cited for non bidding were either “too busy” or “not our scope of work”.

**STAGE ONE**

Bids submitted for this procurement opportunity was evaluated in accordance with a two stage process as detailed within the bid document.

Stage One of the Evaluation Process was based on the evaluation of the Supplier’s submission in accordance with the technical criteria set out in bid document. Stage One was evaluated by the following: Company Experience and Qualifications (20%), Staff Experience and Qualifications (20%), Project Methodology, Materials and Customer Service (40%), Project Schedule and Work Plan (15%) and Health and Safety (5%). A minimum of 75 out of a 100 was required in order to pass the first stage. Both Suppliers met the technical requirements, scores as follows:

**Stage 1 – Technical Score**

Suppliers	Score (Out of 100)	Ranking
Pipeflo Contracting Corp	84	1
D. M. Robichaud Associates	80	2

**STAGE TWO**

Stage Two was evaluated based on pricing. Having met the Stage One criteria, both Suppliers were eligible to move to Stage Two, pricing section, where their bids were opened and the award of the contract was based solely on price. The results of the Stage Two pricing are:

	PipeFlo Contracting Corp.	D.M. Robichaud Associates Ltd.
Part 1, 2, 4*	<b>\$ 472,166.40</b>	\$ 712,218.24
Part 3 – Open Cut Sections	\$ 650,958.72	\$ 370,915.20
Bid Price (including HST)	\$1,123,152.12	\$ 1,083,133.44

\*Staff recommend awarding only parts 1, 2 and 4 (Part 1 – Trenchless repairs, Part 2 – Man Entry and Part 4 – Through pipes)

Since both contractor’s bid price are over the City’s budget, City will award the contract in parts to the lowest supplier for the selected parts according to City’s budget.

As the bids submitted by both contractors are in excess of the budget, the City is exercising its right under section 17.3 of part II of the General Terms and Conditions, which reads, “The City reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to award in whole or in part (including, without limitation, by part, item or group of items), or to award to more than one Supplier”.

It is understood that some open cut locations in Part 3 are ranked higher in the priority list (i.e., Steele Valley Road and Pringle Ave). However, based on the price for open cut received from the two (2) suppliers, they are significantly higher than the City’s expectation and cost estimates. As such, City staff do not recommend including the open cut section in the award, and request these works be included in Asset Management’s 2014 storm sewer repairs program.

The work of Part 1, 2 &4 will commence in October and be completed by the middle of January 2014.



## STAFF AWARD REPORT

Page 1 of 2

To:	Alan Brown, Director, Engineering
Re:	274-Q-13 Water Service and Sanitary Sewer Connections at Various Locations
Date:	October 17, 2013
Prepared by:	Eugene Chen, Capital Works Engineer Ext. 2451 Tony Casale, Senior Construction Buyer Ext. 3190

### PURPOSE:

To obtain approval to award the contract for water service, sanitary and storm sewer connections at various locations.

### RECOMMENDATION:

Recommended Supplier	FDM Contracting Co. Ltd. (Lowest Priced Supplier Location 1-3, 5 and 7) NSJ Waterworx Group Ltd. (Lowest Priced Supplier Location 4 and 6) Finch Paving (1993) Inc. (Lowest Priced Supplier Location 8)	
Less cost of award	\$ 60,852.48	Total Cost of award (Incl. of HST )*

\* Service connections are fully recoverable from homeowners and work does not commence until payment has been received by the City. The issuance of a purchase order is contingent upon receipt of payment from homeowners.

### BACKGROUND:

Upon receipt of applications from City of Markham property owners, engineering staff obtain pricing from qualified companies for the installation of water, storm and/or sanitary service connections to service residential lots. The locations identified in this request for quotation for service connections are as follows;

Location	Address	Description of Work
Location #1	25 Portree Crescent	Water, sanitary and storm connections
Location # 2	156 Church Street	Water service connection
Location # 3	40 West Borough Street	Water and sanitary sewer connections
Location # 4	23 Galsworthy Drive	Water service connection
Location # 5	45Glenbourne Park Drive	Water and sanitary sewer connections
Location # 6	41 Grandview Avenue	Water service connection
Location # 7	41 Scibberas Road	Water service connection
Location # 8	10A Hughson Avenue	Sanitary sewer connection

### BID INFORMATION

Advertised	By Invitation
Bids closed on	October 10, 2013
Number picking up bid documents	5
Number responding to bid	5

**PRICE SUMMARY (Incl. of HST)**

Location	Address	FDM Co. Ltd.	NSJ Waterworx Group Ltd	Finch Paving (1993) Inc.	Sam Rabito Construction Ltd	Hollingworth Construction Co.
1	25 Portree Crescent	<b>\$ 18,316.80</b>	\$ 19,843.20	\$ 24,422.40	\$ 36,379.20	\$ 47,064.00
2	156 Church Street	<b>\$ 4,477.44</b>	\$ 4,579.20	\$ 7,428.48	\$ 6,156.48	\$ 14,287.10
3	40 West Borough Street	<b>\$ 12,007.68</b>	\$ 19,537.92	\$ 16,586.88	\$ 32,257.92	\$ 29,296.70
4	23 Galsworthy Drive	\$ 4,223.04	<b>\$ 2,849.28</b>	\$ 6,003.84	\$ 4,324.80	\$ 14,287.10
5	45 Glenbourne Park Drive	<b>\$ 15,060.48</b>	\$ 18,825.60	\$ 15,060.48	\$ 63,091.20	\$ 34,822.27
6	41 Grandview Avenue	\$ 4,579.20	<b>\$ 3,561.60</b>	\$ 7,021.44	\$ 11,193.60	\$ 14,368.51
7	41 Scibberas Road	<b>\$ 1,526.40</b>	\$ 4,273.92	\$ 7,021.44	\$ 9,667.20	\$ 14,368.51
8	10A Hughson Avenue	\$ 13,737.60	\$ 12,211.20	<b>\$ 3,052.80</b>	\$ 76,320.00	\$ 24,351.17