

City of Mississauga  
**Corporate Report**



<p>Date: July 3, 2020</p> <p>To: Mayor and Members of Council</p>	<p>Originator's files:</p>
<p>From: Geoff Wright, P.Eng, MBA, Commissioner of Transportation and Works</p>	<p>Meeting date: July 22, 2020</p>

## Subject

**Additional Information – 2021 to 2029 Winter Maintenance Contract**

## Recommendation

That the report from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works, dated June 26, 2020 and entitled “*Additional Information – 2021 to 2029 Winter Maintenance Contract*” be received for information.

### Report Highlights

- On June 24, 2020 Budget Committee considered a report from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works, dated May 28, 2020 and entitled “*2020 through 2029 Winter Maintenance Contract*”. The report was deferred by Budget Committee to the July 22, 2020 meeting of Council.
- The purpose of this report is to provide additional information on the new Winter Maintenance Contract, to assist Council in its decision-making, as well as to respond to the comments made by Mr. Christian Parise in his email sent to the Chair and Members of Budget Committee, dated June 23, 2020 and entitled “*Urgent Concerns Re: Winter Maintenance Tender Corporate Report to Budget Committee*”.
- This report provides further information on the new Winter Maintenance Contract. In particular, additional information is provided on the timing of the award for the procurement, detailed information on the list of bids received for the procurement, clarification of increases in the base contract, information on service levels for secondary (residential) roads and clarification of legislative issues in the existing contract versus the new contract.
- Works Operations and Maintenance (WOM) staff have determined that the budget impact of the Base Contract in the New Winter Maintenance contract is \$2.2M annually and \$0.8M for 2021, and not \$3.8M and \$1.3M, respectively, and as previously reported, given identified operational and material savings by using the right number and mix of equipment to perform the job. This also takes into account the cost impact on winter

maintenance of Council's approval on July 8, 2020 of the new on-road and separated bicycle lanes to be introduced in locations across the city to rapidly improve the active transportation network in 2020 as part of the City's COVID-19 Recovery Framework.

## Background

At its meeting of June 24, 2020 Budget Committee considered a report from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works, dated May 28, 2020 and entitled "*2020 through 2029 Winter Maintenance Contract*". The report was deferred by Budget Committee to the July 22, 2020 meeting of Council.

The purpose of this report is to provide additional information on the new Winter Maintenance Contract, to assist Council in its decision-making, as well as to respond to the comments made by Mr. Christian Parise in his email sent to the Chair and Members of Budget Committee, dated June 23, 2020 and entitled "*Urgent Concerns Re: Winter Maintenance Tender Corporate Report to Budget Committee*". A copy of Mr. Parise's email is attached to this report as Appendix 1.

## Comments

Mr. Parise raised the following concerns with the new Winter Maintenance Contract:

### ***"- We have time***

*Before I delve into these 4 concerns raised I would like to assure Members of Council that there is no rush to make a decision on Wednesday."*

Additional comments from Mr. Parise are summarized below:

*"These concerns represent a range of issues relating to both the quality of information presented within the Corporate Report, the winter maintenance contract & resulting costs, however I will focus on the following 4 points:*

- 1. Removal of detailed financial analysis of bid prices, of standby costs (fixed costs) and of operational costs (variable costs) per service item from the Corporate Report.*
- 2. The significant increase to the base contract of \$3.8 million annually and the failure to present an honest assessment of cost changes associated with changes incorporated in to the base contract.*
- 3. The "baked-in" increase in level of service to secondary roads to the base budget by eliminating snow pack conditions through equipment changes that allow salting of secondary roads at the same time as plowing, which was not a formal Council directed activity and which carries a cost increase.*
- 4. Information provided by staff in this report that indicates contractors under the existing contract are not adhering to conditions of the existing contract and that contractors under employment of the City are in contravention with HTA regulation 555/06 'Hours of Service' . \*Legal implications\**

**Timing of Contract:**

As part of the preparation of the procurement for the new Winter Maintenance Contract, staff consulted with potential bidders with a view to improving the procurement process. A consistent message from potential bidders was the requirement to have 18 months lead time from the award of the procurement to the commencement of the new contract, to provide time for the successful bidders to secure the required vehicles and equipment.

In addition, the existing winter maintenance contract cannot be extended for the following reasons:

- All 19 contractors in the existing contract would have to agree to extend for the extra one year holding their 2020-2021 prices for the 2021-2022 winter season. Staff discussed this with the existing contractors in 2019 during the pre-work for the new procurement and all 19 contractors were not willing to extend; therefore, this option was not pursued any further.
- Tendering individual procurements for those unwilling to extend would be problematic to administer, would likely lead to significantly higher operational costs due to the short contract duration and would require significant staff efforts above and beyond that which has already been exerted.
- Using this option would not allow for the improvements and efficiencies to be made to operations in terms of efficiencies, deployment and adherence to standards, practices and regulations as described further in this report.
- As a result, this option is simply not feasible.

**Detailed Financial Analysis:**

In consultation with staff from Materiel Management, WOM staff made the decision not to include the list of bids received for this procurement as appendices in the report from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works dated May 28, 2020 and entitled "*2021 through 2029 Winter Maintenance Contract*". As mentioned by members of Budget Committee at its meeting of June 24, 2020, the report is detailed and complicated as is, and for this reason, staff chose not to include the results of the procurement in the report with a view to streamlining the document.

In response to Mr. Parise's request, attached as Appendix 2 is the list of bids received for the procurement for the new Winter Maintenance Contract.

**Base Winter Maintenance Contract:**

A staff team comprising Scott Holmes, Senior Manager, Works Administration, Operations and Maintenance; Ken Laupé, Manager, Works Operations; Jerry Pinchak, Maintenance Contract Co-ordinator; Justin Hollet, Maintenance Contracts Co-ordinator, Ryan McHugh, Supervisor,

Operations Program Co-ordinator; and, Stephan Banic, Operations Co-ordinator, have been working on the new Winter Maintenance Contract since March 2019, approximately 18 months. The staff on this team have dedicated the better part of their municipal careers to winter maintenance best practices and procedures and has a combined 70+ years of experience in winter maintenance contracts, management and execution of winter maintenance activities.

Further, the City is well served by several of the above staff who provide volunteer instruction on behalf of the Ontario Good Roads Association (OGRA):

- Ken Laupé, in addition to his 30+ years of municipal winter maintenance experience, is also a Past President of the OGRA, and provides winter instruction at both their Road and Snow Schools. The Snow School is recognized as the premier training school in Ontario for teaching best winter maintenance practices. Ken was also a contributor to the OGRA/Conservation Ontario “*Good Practices for Salt Management in Vulnerable Areas*” document and sits on the Minimum Maintenance Standards (MMS) for Municipal Highways Review Committee.
- Both Scott Holmes and Ryan McHugh have recently joined the OGRA instruction team in teaching winter maintenance to other municipalities; they both provide an important complementary skill set perspective to winter operations.

Some of the City of Mississauga’s winter maintenance practices are outdated and not consistent with current industry best practices. For example, with respect to the existing contract the following provides more specific information:

- front end loaders and farm style tractors are used to plow secondary roads followed by trucks to salt the roads, rather than using combination plow and salt trucks to do both activities at the same time;
- inadequate numbers of the above loaders and tractors combined with subsequent (and sometimes multiple) salting operations result in route completion times sometimes taking longer than approved City service levels and the Province’s MMS, rather than utilizing the appropriate number of combination plow and salt trucks; and,
- with the existing operations, more salt is required in attempting to break up the snow pack road surface as a result of vehicle traffic prior to plowing operations.

In summary, the City’s outdated winter maintenance practices result in increased operational costs and additional salt use based on existing procedures. Winter maintenance service levels and the MMS are met, for the most part, given the City’s ability to “set the clock” with legislation recently introduced by the Province. Municipalities now have the ability to declare a Significant Weather Event to delay the start of the clock, subject to certain conditions as established by Environment Canada.

In addition, consultants were engaged in 2019 to conduct a Yard Master Plan review for the Parks, Forestry and Environment (PFE) and WOM Divisions. The results of the Yard Master Plan review will inform the 2022 Business Planning and Budget Process.

There are four yards shared by the PFE and WOM Divisions, namely Clarkson, Malton, Mavis and Meadowvale. The Mavis yard was constructed in 1956 and is 64 years old. The Clarkson and Malton yards were the next yards constructed in 1977 and are 43 years old. The Meadowvale yard was the most recent yard constructed in 1996 and is 24 years old.

Preliminary results from Phase One of the Yard Master Plan review indicate the following for the shared yards:

*“At all of the Yards, there is insufficient outdoor space to store the vehicles, equipment and materials. For example, some contractor employees are forced to use one parking stall for both their private vehicle and their work vehicles. This requires additional time for parking and decreases contractor productivity;*

*At all of the Yards, there is insufficient outdoor space to manoeuvre the vehicles, equipment and materials safely and efficiently around the yard. This shortage of space increases the time required to park the vehicles, and increases the risk of vehicle and pedestrian accidents. It also increases the risk of work refusals;”*

The ability of WOM staff to continue to meet winter maintenance service levels and MMS is not sustainable given the status of the yards and related facilities, as well as the number and mix of vehicles and equipment included in the existing Winter Maintenance Contract.

As a result and as a first step, WOM staff prepared the new base Winter Maintenance Contract with a focus on ensuring operational efficiency and setting equipment levels based on established best service delivery and salt management practices with a view to providing Council approved service levels and to meeting the MMS for winter operations under the *Municipal Act 2001*.

The new Winter Maintenance Contract also had to take into account the additional winter maintenance requirements of the Hurontario LRT targeted for implementation in 2024.

At its meeting on July 8, 2020 Council considered the report from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works entitled *“The City of Mississauga’s Active Transportation COVID-19 Recovery Framework”*. The Active Transportation COVID-19 Recovery Framework recommends adding 17.9 kilometres (11.1 miles) of new on-road bicycle lanes and separated bicycle lanes in locations across the City. The new Winter Maintenance Contract considers revisions to operations as the modes of transportation change as the City moves forward with both the Hurontario LRT and Active Transportation initiatives.

The cost increase in the new base Winter Maintenance Contract, in comparison to the existing base winter contract, is as a result of the following:

- various increases in the operational and standby rates;
- increased number of standby days for certain types of equipment;
- changes to the mix of equipment; and,
- increases in the number of equipment.

Appendix 3 summarizes, in detail, the above-noted changes and the related cost impact, not taking into account operational efficiencies.

### **Secondary (Residential) Roads:**

The City's service level for secondary roads varies between 24 hours to more than 36 hours after a winter event depending on the amount of snow accumulation.

The Province's MMS service level for secondary roads is more specific for their treatment (salt or plow/salt) after a winter event:

- within 24 hours for snow accumulation; and,
- within 16 hours for icy roadway conditions.

The MMS service level, while voluntary to be adopted by municipalities, is deemed by the Province to be a reasonable standard in providing protection from legal claims regarding personal injury and property damage.

Currently, completion of secondary roads following a winter event generally meets the City's 24 hour service level for snow accumulations of 15 cm or less. However, when subsequent salting operations are included due to extended winter events or back-to-back storms, then the 24 hour service level is usually exceeded on a number of routes.

As noted earlier in this report, one of the many focuses of the new Winter Maintenance Contract includes meeting the Province's MMS. As both the City's and MMS service levels are consistent regarding snow accumulation at 15 cm or less (24 hours), staff's efforts in procuring additional equipment is not an increase in service level but rather a diligent endeavour to meet both service levels with respect to plowing and salting by following industry best practice of utilizing combination plow and salter units.

### **Legislative Issues:**

*O. Regulation 555/06, Hours of Service of the Highway Traffic Act* speaks to the hours of operation of Commercial Vehicle Operators Registration (CVOR) licensed equipment by drivers, which typically includes dump trucks with plows and wings and larger pickup trucks. However,

they do not include graders, front end loaders, farm tractors, sidewalk tractors, backhoes and skid steers, and the drivers of this equipment are exempt from the regulation.

Drivers of CVOR licensed equipment can be on duty (combination of driving and non-driving time while at work) up to 14 hours in a 24 hour period, with the remaining time deemed off duty or a rest period. During prolonged or severe winter events, under the regulation, the City can declare an "Hours of Service Exemption", which allows drivers to exceed the 14 hours. The City though, limits its staff to 16 hours in keeping with its collective agreement with CUPE Local 66, while allowing contractor drivers to exceed 16 hours as they operate under their own CVOR certificate, and not the City's.

During the past two winter seasons with a new Works Administration and Operations Maintenance management team in place, it was identified that several contractors using CVOR licensed equipment did not have replacement drivers as required under the contract when routes were still incomplete. Summarily, liquidated damages were applied and routes were either done by others or left unattended until the drivers returned. This may result in service levels not being met. In speaking with the contractors, they admit to staffing challenges at the beginning of the winter season as the same drivers are used for their summer construction operations; retention of drivers who sometimes go to the "highest bidder" for their services; and, the lack of qualified drivers, whose pool is shared with other GTA contractors. Staff have confirmed the same in discussion with other municipalities and contractors.

For the upcoming year of the current contract, staff are reviewing routes to determine if efficiencies can be found to shorten their lengths. In addition, staff will continue to emphasize to the contractors the need to follow the contract with respect to a sufficient number of qualified replacement drivers when required. Staff will continue to apply liquidated damages against the contractors when the contract is not adhered to.

Further, Mr. Parise claims that WOM staff may be in collusion with winter maintenance contractors. WOM considers this a very serious allegation as staff are expected to strictly adhere to the City's Code of Conduct. We are unaware of any actions by staff to support Mr. Parise's allegations and therefore welcome Mr. Parise to provide evidence to support his claims so that this matter can be further investigated.

To address the industry challenges, and ensure adherence to both the City's service levels and Province's MMS, staff are requesting additional equipment. This will allow for:

- route completion times more in line with the maximum "Hours Of Service" driving times (thereby mitigating but not necessarily eliminating the need for replacement drivers);
- ensuring industry best practices are applied for better efficiencies regarding equipment deployment; and,

- better adherence to effective salt management principles (“the right amount in the right place at the right time”) with a view to material savings especially in salt vulnerable areas.

## Financial Impact

In light of the presentations at the Budget Committee meeting of June 24, 2020 from Gary Kent, Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer, and Jeff Jackson, Director of Finance and Treasurer, on the COVID-19: Financial Recovery Pillar, 2020 Financial Update and the Preliminary 2021 Operating Budget, WOM staff diligently reviewed the base contract in the New Winter Maintenance Contract with a view to identifying and quantifying the operational efficiencies and material (salt) savings, and related impact, to the annual and 2021 base contract budget increases.

The following table shows the results:

Winter Services	Existing Contract Total	New Contract Total	Contract Increase Annual	% Tax Increase Annual	Contract Increase 2021	% Tax Increase 2021
Base Contract	\$14.8	\$18.6	\$3.8	0.71%	\$1.3	0.24%
Operational cost savings in New Contract Base	Not applicable	-\$1.7	-\$1.7	-0.31%	-\$0.6	-0.1%
Material Savings in New Contract Base	Not applicable	-\$0.4	-\$0.4	-0.07%	-\$0.1	-0.02%
<b>Total New Contract Base</b>	Not applicable	<b>\$16.5</b>	<b>\$1.7</b>	<b>0.33%</b>	<b>\$0.6</b>	<b>0.12%</b>

As part of the City’s COVID-19 Recovery Framework, it was recommended that new on-road and separated bicycle lanes be introduced in locations across the city to rapidly improve the active transportation network in 2020. On July 8, 2020, Council approved moving forward with this recommendation. This will result in an increase of \$0.5M annually in 2021 operating budget for Winter Maintenance, which will partially offset the operational and material savings identified above from \$2.1M to \$1.6M on annual basis and \$0.7M to \$0.5M for 2021, exclusively.

## Conclusion

This report provides further information for Budget Committee’s consideration on the new Winter Maintenance Contract. In particular, additional information is provided on the timing of the award for the procurement, list of bids received for this procurement, clarification of increases in the base contract, information on service levels for secondary (residential) roads and clarification of legislative issues in the existing contract versus the new contract.



---

In addition, WOM staff have determined that the budget impact of the Base Contract in the New Winter Maintenance contract is \$2.2M annually and \$0.8M for 2021, and not \$3.8M and \$1.3M, respectively, given identified operational and material savings by using the right number and mix of equipment to perform the job.

## Attachments

- Appendix 1: Email from Mr. Christian Parise to the Chair and Members of Budget Committee, dated June 23, 2020 entitled "*Urgent Concerns Re: Winter Maintenance Tender Corporate Report to Budget Committee*"
- Appendix 2: List of Bids received for the Procurement for the New Winter Maintenance Contract
- Appendix 3: Explanation of Changes in Base Contract for New Winter Maintenance Contract



---

Geoff Wright, P.Eng, MBA, Commissioner of Transportation and Works

Prepared by: Mickey Frost, Director, Works Operations and Maintenance Division

**Mickey Frost**

---

**Subject:** Urgent Concerns Re: Winter Maintenance Tender Corporate Report to Budget Committee

**From:** Christian Parise

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 23, 2020 12:36 AM

**To:** Mayor Bonnie Crombie; Stephen Dasko; Karen Ras; Chris Fonseca; John Kovac; Carolyn Parrish; Ron Starr; Dipika Damerla; Matt Mahoney; Pat Saito; Sue McFadden; George Carlson

**Cc:** Paul Mitcham; Geoff Wright; Mickey Frost; Scott Holmes

**Subject:** Urgent Concerns Re: Winter Maintenance Tender Corporate Report to Budget Committee

Madame Mayor & Members of Budget Committee,

I write to you with significant concerns regarding a Corporate Report coming to the Budget Committee on Wednesday (Agenda Item 6.4) which recommends the award of the 2021-2029 Winter Maintenance Contract. In light of the strenuous fiscal future that lies ahead for everyone I implore that both Council and staff see pause to this contract award given the concerns I will detail in this communication. These concerns represent a range of issues relating to both the quality of information presented within the Corporate Report, the winter maintenance contract & resulting costs, however I will focus on the following 4 points:

1. Removal of detailed financial analysis of bid prices, of standby costs (fixed costs) and of operational costs (variable costs) per service item from the Corporate Report.
2. The significant increase to the base contract of \$3.8 million annually and the failure to present an honest assessment of cost changes associated with changes incorporated in to the base contract.
3. The "baked-in" increase in level of service to secondary roads to the base budget by eliminating snow pack conditions through equipment changes that allow salting of secondary roads at the same time as plowing, which was not a formal Council directed activity and which carries a cost increase.
4. Information provided by staff in this report that indicates contractors under the existing contract are not adhering to conditions of the existing contract and that contractors under employment of the City are in contravention with HTA regulation 555/06 'Hours of Service'. \*Legal implications\*

To be clear I am not a friend, relative and/or acquaintance of any prospective winter maintenance contractor or employee and have nothing to gain personally by addressing these matters. I believe I offer Council a uniquely qualified opinion on this matter for a few reasons briefly summarized in this paragraph. The geographical assignment of resources (namely vehicular) is a topic I have great passion for and which I have studied on my own time for several years, namely through the lens of transit scheduling. Winter maintenance activities can be quantified very similarly to the way public transit operations are. Service levels are not determined by policy, but by how much resources you apply to any given area and based on the productivity of such resources. With this in mind it should be of no surprise that I took a very keen interest in municipal winter maintenance back in the fall of 2012. In person observation of winter maintenance activities with many sleepless nights along with the study of staff reports and winter maintenance tenders of various GTA municipalities has contributed to my knowledge base and continued interest in the topic. It is with this experience and knowledge that I bring you these concerns and by extension a better deal for Mississauga.

**- We have time**

Before I delve into these 4 concerns raised I would like to assure Members of Council that there is no rush to make a decision on Wednesday. If Council chooses to award this contract on Wednesday then it will be doing so 16 months in advance of the start of contracted services. This 16 month period is far longer than the previous

contract which was awarded 4 months in advance of the contracted services start date. Likewise various surrounding GTA municipalities have had far shorter award periods:

- The City of Toronto awarded its winter maintenance contracts for approximately 1000 pieces of equipment/crews on 12 & 19 March and 12 May 2015, 5-7 months in advance of the contracted services start date.
- The City of Vaughan awarded their winter maintenance contracts for 123 pieces of equipment/crews on 19 April 2016, 6 months in advance of the contracted services start date.
- The City of Brampton awarded their winter maintenance contracts for 250 pieces of equipment/crews around April-May of 2017, 5-6 months in advance of the contracted services start date.
- The Region of Peel awarded their winter maintenance contract for 54 pieces of equipment/crews on 31 May 2019, 5 months in advance of the contracted services start date
- The City of Hamilton awarded their winter maintenance contract for 52 pieces of equipment/crews on 27 January 2020, 9 months in advance of the contract services start date.
- The City of Burlington awarded their winter maintenance contract for 24 pieces of equipment/crews on 21 April 2020, 6 months in advance of the contracted services start date.

In addition to the above, provision 10 of the Form of Tender of this contract stipulates that bid prices received will remain open for acceptance for a period of 210 days from the closing day of the tender. This tender closed on 4 May 2020 which means that the bid prices received are able to be accepted by the City up until 30 November 2020.

#### **- The Concerns**

*1: The removal of detailed financial analysis of bid prices, of standby costs (fixed costs) and of operational costs (variable costs) per service item from the Corporate Report.*

I am often critical of transparency at The City of Mississauga, however on the subject of Winter Maintenance Tender Award Reports the City has been a leader. The provision of detailed financial analysis of contracted winter maintenance costs dates back to the formation of the Corporation in 1974 and has been applied consistently until this Corporate Report. The inclusion of this information has shown Council and the public how much equipment is being procured and at what cost. It demonstrates exactly what the City's contracted standby (fixed) costs are per service item, costs we assume regardless of the amount of winter events we see, and what the estimated operational hours and costs are, costs which we incur only as we see winter events.

The removal of this information from the Corporate Report is akin to removing a microscope on the costs of the winter maintenance program. It is a step in the direction away from transparency and trust and it is particularly egregious at a time when the City and its citizens face troubling financial headwaters. I believe for this reason alone it is inappropriate for the Committee to follow staff's recommendation to award this contract at this time and until a full breakdown of prices is provided.

*For reference I have appended a folder to the end of this email containing every single Winter Maintenance Contract Award Report from 1974 onward with the exception of the 1979/1980 and 2000/2003 contract reports which have not been located. APPENDIX A*

*2: The significant increase to the base contract of \$3.8 million annually and the failure to present an honest assessment of cost changes associated with changes incorporated in to the base contract.*

It is crucial to pay close attention to standby costs as these are costs we assume regardless of how much the equipment/crews are used, they represent the fixed cost of the program. Likewise a contract that assumes there

will be operational savings to offset the increase in standby costs depends on high volumes of winter events, as the less winter events we see the less opportunity there is to generate savings through operational costs. Let's examine these costs.

### **2014-2021 Tender:**

- 2014-2015 Contract Season (initial term)
  - Standby Cost: \$9,810,908.66 (71% of total cost)
  - Operational Cost: \$4,015,046.22 (29% of total cost)
  - Total Cost: \$13,825,954.88

2020-2021 Contract Season (with 2% annual cost escalation applied to initial term costs)

- Standby Cost: \$11,184,435.87 (71% of total cost)
- Operational Cost: \$4,577,152.69 (29% of total cost)
- Total Cost: \$15,761,588.56

### **2021-2029 Tender:**

- 2021-2022 Contract Season (initial term)
  - Standby Cost: \$15,074,617 (72.5% of total cost)
  - Operational Cost: \$5,698,589 (27.5% of total cost)
  - Total Cost: \$20,773,206

#### **Change in Costs from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022:**

- Standby Cost: + \$3,890,181.13 (35% increase)
- Operational Cost: + \$1,121,436.31 (24.5% increase)
- Total Cost: + \$5,011,617.44 (32% increase)

As we can see from the above analysis this new contract involves a significant increase to both standby and operational costs totaling \$5,011,617.44 annually representing just under a 32% increase. It should be noted that this report actually cites two different numbers for the 2021-2022 winter costs. On page 6 in the breakdown of standby, operational and total costs it cites a total cost of \$20,773,206, however in Table 1 on page 9 cites a total annual cost of \$18.6 million. Likewise where my analysis based on a 2% annual cost escalation shows a total cost of the last year of the existing contract to be \$15,761,588.56, Table 1 on page 9 cites a total annual cost of \$14.8 million for the existing contract. Unfortunately and despite providing a different set of numbers, Table 1 on page 9 does not breakdown the standby and operational costs associated with each line item.

On page 3 of this Report we are told that:

*"An eight year period was selected to take advantage of more competitive pricing that is expected for a longer term contract. The existing contract was seven years in length. Staff decided to move forward with an eight-year contract based on discussions with other municipalities and also based on the financial benefit received from increasing the City's previous contract from five to seven years."*

I believe it is reasonable for staff to have expected more competitive pricing as it's a simple question of amortization. If I need to procure a piece of equipment that costs \$200,000 and I need to recuperate that cost in seven years, then to break even I need to charge \$28,571 annually to break even on capital acquisition costs. However, if I instead have 8 years to recuperate that capital acquisition cost of \$200,000, then I need to charge \$25,000 annually to break even on capital acquisition costs, which represents a savings of \$3,571 annually per piece of equipment. Multiply that by 200 pieces of equipment and you stand to generate annual savings of \$714,200. If this contract did in fact receive more competitive pricing on a per unit basis then that would mean

that the increase in costs of the base contract are in fact greater than the \$3.8 million cited in the report and are offset by savings achieved through a longer contract term. To indicate both the savings achieved by the longer term of the contract and the true cost impact of changes to the contract would be a far more honest presentation of this new contract. This report camouflages these positive and negative impacts by only presenting the net impact on the budget and by extension removes the opportunity for scrutiny.

*3: The "baked-in" increase in level of service to secondary roads to the base budget by eliminating snow pack conditions through equipment changes that allow salting of secondary roads at the same time as plowing, which was not a formal Council directed activity and which carries a cost increase.*

Let's examine average standby prices provided in the initial term of the 2014-2021 winter maintenance tenders:

- Average standby costs for Tractor plows were \$22,145 per unit and multiplied by 10 units for a total annual standby cost of \$221,450.
- Average standby for Loader plows were \$25,338 and multiplied by 21 units for a total annual standby cost of \$532,098.
- Total standby costs for the 31 loader and tractor plows were \$753,548, for an average per unit standby cost of \$24,308
- Average standby costs for single axle combination trucks were \$45,385 representing a premium of \$21,077 per unit compared to loader/tractor plows

Based on this information we can then apply a per unit premium of \$21,077 to the 31 loader/tractor units being replaced with single axle combination trucks, along with a \$45,385 cost for the additional 24 single axle combination truck costs. Based on the 2014-2021 tender prices we can therefore calculate the cost increase for this equipment/service level change:

- An annual increase in standby costs of \$653,387 for the conversion of 31 loader/tractor plows to single axle combination trucks
- An annual increase in standby costs of \$1,089,240 for the addition of 24 single axle combination trucks
- An annual increase in total standby costs of \$1,742,627

Owing to the significant premium for combination salt/plow trucks and at an operational rate of \$80 an hour, this change would require each vehicle to produce an annual savings of **396 hours** in order to break even. Per the new winter maintenance contract (PRC002049) each single axle combination truck is estimated to work an average of **200 hours** per year. In other words it is virtually impossible for this change to produce any cost savings for the City.

Given that this change in service level was not directed by Council, why was it appropriate for staff to bake this change into the contract? Fortunately staff included a request for loader plows in the contract so this is not a change that is set in stone.

*4: Information provided by staff in this report that indicates contractors under the existing contract are not adhering to conditions of the existing contract and that contractors working for the City are in contravention with HTA regulation 555/06 'Hours of Service'.*

On page 5 of the Report in the section regarding the base contract we are told that:

*"Further, in the existing Winter Maintenance Contract, there are 31 tractor and loader plow units, which using the same operator, are required to operate for more than 24 consecutive hours to complete their routes, which is outside MMS Regulation 239/02. To ensure the City is in compliance with the time limits around all*

*applicable legislation for winter operations, including prescribed time limits that operators can work under the Hours of Service (HOS) requirements in the Highway Traffic Act, staff have replaced these 31 units with 55 units of single-axle and tandem axle vehicle plows, which are more appropriate for the intended work, and result in a net increase to the base contract of 24 units. The additional equipment will provide for a more effective removal of packed snow on the secondary roads, while applying road salt at the same time. This would be in keeping with best practices currently being performed by other GTA municipalities."*

In this paragraph staff suggest that not only are Council established levels of service and MMS 239/09 levels of service are not being met on secondary roads, they also indicate that City contractors are not in compliance with the Ontario HTA Regulation 555/06 "Hours of Service" which restrict extended operation of commercial vehicles by a single operator to no more than 14 hours of active duty time within a 24 hour time period. City staff note that loader/tractor plows are being operated for more than 24 consecutive hours, 10 hours in excess of the HTA regulation.

On the subject of service levels not being met on secondary roads following plowing events, this report represents the first time that staff have noted in a Corporate Report that this is in fact the case. However, in the 2020 Roads Budget & Business Plan Document Key Performance Indicators we are told that staff met Winter Response Times 100% of the time for 2016, 2017, 2018 and that levels would be met 100% for 2019 through 2023. If this is not in fact the case and that levels of service on secondary roads are not being met then why are we only being told this 6 years into the existing winter maintenance contract?

On the subject of loader/tractor plows being operated by the same operator for more than 24 consecutive hours, this in spite of the existing winter maintenance contract including provisions that are meant to prevent this very sort of thing from happening. Tender FA.49.324-14 (existing winter maintenance contract) includes the following special provisions:

*- SP 28 QUALIFIED OPERATORS*

*The Contractor shall provide qualified winter roadway maintenance operators that are competent to operate the equipment supplied. A qualified operator shall have the appropriate licenses to operate the equipment specified and has operated a similar piece of equipment for winter roadway maintenance purposes. The qualified operate shall also understand and be able to operate the equipment including all apparatus and controls in a safe, efficient and effective manner while completing work.*

*In addition, the Contractor is required to supply qualified spare operators during prolonged snow falls in order that operations are continuous. Failure to provide competent and trained operators and trained operators, including spare operators, will result in liquidated damages being applied against the Contractor (refer to SP 35 - Liquidated Damages).*

*-SP 30 HOURS OF WORK*

*The contractor shall ensure that all equipment and operating personnel comply with the hour requirement of the Highway Traffic Act, as amended, and Ontario Regulation 555/06.*

*-SP 35 LIQUIDATED DAMAGES*

*All liquidated damages, as prescribed in the table below, may be deducted from any payments due to the Contractor:*

*Item - Qualified Operators*

*Description - Failure to provide competent and trained equipment operators (including spares).*

*Liquidated Damages - One (1) days standby amount per occurrence.*

Further to the Special Provisions set out in the tender, per the "*Minutes of the Bidder's Information Meeting of Thursday, April 24, 2014*" this required compliance to HTA Regulation 555/06 is reaffirmed in response to two questions which with staff responses are cited in their entirety below:

*Question 11: In order to comply with the hours of work regulations during continuous operation, do we have to bring in additional operators?*

*Response: Yes. The Contractor shall ensure that all equipment and operating personnel comply with the work hour requirements of the highway Traffic Act, as amended, and Ontario Regulation 555/06, please see SP28 and SP30.*

*Question 31: Does the hours of work requirements for licensed vehicles apply to non-license units?*

*Response: The work hour requirements of the Highway Traffic Act and associated regulations are to be observed for both licensed and non-licensed vehicles.*

If contractors are not in compliance with HTA 555/06 "Hours of Service" regulations then City staff are failing to enforce provisions and apply liquidated damages as set out in the existing winter maintenance contract (FA.49.324-14). This responsibility falls squarely on the managers and supervisors of the Winter Maintenance Program. **This could be the result of contractors colluding with City staff and providing kickbacks to staff for not having to bear the cost of supplying spare operators to ensure compliance with the above cited regulation and this is something that should be investigated by the City's Audit and Legal Departments.**

In line with the existing tender, the new tender (PRC002049) includes clear language that indicates winter maintenance contractors must comply with "Hours of Service" Regulation 555/06.

*For reference I have appended in a folder the Contract Document of the existing contract (FA.49.324-14) and the Minutes of the Bidder Information Session cited above. APPENDIX B*

#### **- Where do we go from here?**

Given the number of concerns outlined above, I strongly suggest that Budget Committee seek greater understanding of the City's Winter Maintenance Operations before making any decisions on the future of Winter Maintenance in the City of Mississauga. In a worst case scenario City staff could pursue an additional one year extension to the existing contract. A number of GTA municipalities have extended their winter maintenance contracts in order for various reviews to be conducted including The Region of Peel in 2015 and in 2017 and the City of Vaughan in 2014. The City of Markham in 2015 chose to pursue a 3 year extension to their roadway salting and plowing contract in light of staff being under the impression that better prices could not be achieved through re-tender. In 2017 Markham chose to pursue a 2 year extension to their residential roadway plowing contract under the same basis.

*For reference I have appended a folder with the Staff Reports to the respective councils requesting extensions to existing contracts. APPENDIX C*

I am currently in the process of performing a route by route analysis of the City's winter maintenance operations that has been made possible thanks to a FOI request I filed with the City for winter maintenance route maps in February of this year (FOI #2020-1062). I have completed the analysis of the City's priority plow and secondary plow routes, along with having completed priority salt route tabulations for the Mavis Works yard. I expect to be able to furnish Madame Mayor, Members of Council and City Staff with my analysis in **3 weeks time**. I

believe the analysis I am performing could be instrumental in designing a more balanced winter maintenance program by identifying unbalanced routes, risks of poor productivity, changes to operational methodologies among other suggestions based on studied material and in person observations.

*I have appended in a folder my completed route analysis work to date for those who wish to see. APPENDIX D*

Given the weight of the concerns expressed here I trust that the Committee and Staff will make the right decision.

Respectfully,  
Christian Parise

#### Appendix A



[Corporate Reports on Winter Maintenance Contrac...](#)

#### Appendix B



[Mississauga 2014-2021 Winter Tender](#)

#### Appendix C



[Winter Maintenance Contract Extensions](#)

#### Appendix D



[Mississauga Winter Control Route Analysis](#)

CC:  
Paul Mitcham,  
Chief Administrative Officer

Geoff Wright,  
Commissioner of Transportation & Works

Mickey Frost,  
Director, Works Operation & Maintenance

Scott Holmes,  
Senior Manager, Works Administration, Operations and  
Maintenance



## 2021 - 2029 Winter Maintenance Services Contract

## Item 1A - Combination Single Axle Truck with Operator

## Clarkson District

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
1A	Combination Single Axle Truck with Operator	14	144	\$954,132.48			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	14	\$991,872.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	14	\$844,704.00
					Ashland Construction Group Ltd.	14	\$905,184.00
					Ferrovia Services Canada Ltd	14	\$2,157,664.32
					Gazzola Paving Limited	14	\$1,294,272.00
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	14	\$1,108,800.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	14	\$761,725.44
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	14	\$645,120.00
					ROA INC.	14	\$774,103.68
					Thorntree Industries Ltd.	14	\$683,424.00

## Mavis

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
1A	Combination Single Axle Truck with Operator	29	144	\$1,976,417.28			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	29	\$2,012,832.00
					1942537 ONTARIO LTD.	10	\$532,800.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	29	\$2,021,184.00
					Ashland Construction Group Ltd.	29	\$1,875,024.00
					Ferrovia Services Canada Ltd	29	\$3,917,797.92
					Gazzola Paving Limited	29	\$2,422,080.00
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	29	\$2,296,800.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	29	\$1,513,841.76
					PAVE-TAR CONSTRUCTION LTD.	29	\$1,490,832.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	29	\$1,670,400.00
					ROA INC.	29	\$1,603,500.48
					Thorntree Industries Ltd.	29	\$1,415,664.00

## Malton

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
1A	Combination Single Axle Truck with Operator	9	144	\$613,370.88			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	9	\$650,592.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	9	\$458,784.00
					Ashland Construction Group Ltd.	9	\$581,904.00
					Ferrovia Services Canada Ltd	9	\$1,555,459.20
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	9	\$745,200.00
					Gazzola Paving Limited	9	\$918,864.00
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	9	\$712,800.00
					Maple-Crete Inc.	9	\$644,112.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	9	\$504,247.68
					Pacific Paving Ltd	9	\$511,920.00
					PAVE-TAR CONSTRUCTION LTD.	9	\$505,440.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	9	\$440,640.00
					ROA INC.	9	\$497,638.08
					Thorntree Industries Ltd.	9	\$439,344.00

## Meadowdale

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
1A	Combination Single Axle Truck with Operator	15	144	\$1,022,284.80			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	15	\$1,058,400.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	15	\$905,040.00
					Ashland Construction Group Ltd.	15	\$969,840.00
					Ferrovia Services Canada Ltd	15	\$2,248,754.40
					Gazzola Paving Limited	15	\$1,350,000.00
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	15	\$1,188,000.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	15	\$810,907.20
					Pacific Paving Ltd	15	\$683,640.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	15	\$864,000.00
					ROA INC.	15	\$829,396.80
					Thorntree Industries Ltd.	15	\$732,240.00

## 2021 - 2029 Winter Maintenance Services Contract

## Item 2A - Combination Tandem Axle Truck with Operator

## Clarkson District

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
2A	Combination Tandem Axle Truck with Operator	5	144	\$366,278.40			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	5	\$396,000.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	5	\$265,680.00
					Ashland Construction Group Ltd.	5	\$344,880.00
					Ferrovia Services Canada Ltd	5	\$1,125,439.20
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	5	\$421,200.00
					Gazzola Paving Limited	5	\$624,960.00
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	5	\$612,000.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	5	\$355,680.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	5	\$288,000.00
					ROA INC.	5	\$290,304.00
					sanscon construction ltd	5	\$369,057.60
					Thorntree Industries Ltd.	5	\$323,280.00

## Mavis

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
2A	Combination Tandem Axle Truck with Operator	20	144	\$1,465,113.60			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	20	\$1,471,680.00
					1942537 ONTARIO LTD.	10	\$561,600.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	20	\$1,062,720.00
					Ashland Construction Group Ltd.	20	\$1,379,520.00
					Ferrovia Services Canada Ltd	20	\$2,927,865.60
					Gazzola Paving Limited	20	\$1,817,280.00
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	20	\$1,308,412.80
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	20	\$1,145,404.80
					PAVE-TAR CONSTRUCTION LTD.	20	\$1,396,800.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	20	\$1,440,000.00
					ROA INC.	20	\$1,161,216.00
					sanscon construction ltd	5	\$369,057.60

## Malton

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
2A	Combination Tandem Axle Truck with Operator	30	144	\$2,197,670.40			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	30	\$2,190,240.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	30	\$1,594,080.00
					Ashland Construction Group Ltd.	30	\$2,069,280.00
					Ferrovia Services Canada Ltd	30	\$4,060,670.40
					Gazzola Paving Limited	30	\$2,656,800.00
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	30	\$1,832,371.20
					Maple-Crete Inc.	10	\$748,800.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	30	\$1,703,116.80
					Pacific Paving Ltd	30	\$1,857,600.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	30	\$1,944,000.00
					ROA INC.	30	\$1,741,824.00

## Meadowvale

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
2A	Combination Tandem Axle Truck with Operator	19	144	\$1,391,857.92			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	19	\$1,400,832.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	19	\$1,009,584.00
					Ashland Construction Group Ltd.	19	\$1,310,544.00
					Ferrovia Services Canada Ltd	19	\$2,802,977.28
					Gazzola Paving Limited	19	\$1,737,360.00
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	19	\$1,295,003.52
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	19	\$1,098,093.60
					Pacific Paving Ltd	19	\$1,042,416.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	19	\$1,368,000.00
					ROA INC.	19	\$1,103,155.20

2021 - 2029 Winter Maintenance Services Contract

Item 3A - Combination Tri-Axle Truck with Operator

Clarkson District

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
3A	Combination Tri-Axle Truck with Operator	7	144	\$534,643.20			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	7	\$552,384.00
					1942537 ONTARIO LTD.	7	\$413,280.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	7	\$397,152.00
					CSL Group Ltd	7	\$897,120.00
					Ferrovial Services Canada Ltd	7	\$1,357,392.96
					Gazzola Paving Limited	7	\$736,848.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	7	\$438,661.44
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	7	\$443,520.00
					ROA INC.	7	\$379,501.92
					sanscon construction ltd	7	\$533,524.32

Mavis

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
3A	Combination Tri-Axle Truck with Operator	6	144	\$458,265.60			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	6	\$478,656.00
					1942537 ONTARIO LTD.	6	\$354,240.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	6	\$340,416.00
					Ferrovial Services Canada Ltd	6	\$1,297,935.36
					Gazzola Paving Limited	6	\$650,592.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	6	\$405,639.36
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	6	\$591,840.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	6	\$430,729.92
					PAVE-TAR CONSTRUCTION LTD.	6	\$578,880.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	6	\$414,720.00
					ROA INC.	6	\$325,287.36
					sanscon construction ltd	6	\$457,306.56

Malton

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
3A	Combination Tri-Axle Truck with Operator	2	144	\$152,755.20			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	2	\$184,608.00
					1942537 ONTARIO LTD.	2	\$118,080.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	2	\$113,472.00
					Ferrovial Services Canada Ltd	2	\$721,653.12
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	2	\$198,720.00
					Gazzola Paving Limited	2	\$282,528.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	2	\$119,232.00
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	2	\$197,280.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	2	\$124,951.68
					Norbok Contracting Ltd.	2	\$178,030.08
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	2	\$141,120.00
					ROA INC.	2	\$108,429.12
					Thorn tree Industries Ltd.	2	\$135,072.00

Meadowdale

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
3A	Combination Tri-Axle Truck with Operator	2	144	\$152,755.20			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	2	\$184,608.00
					1942537 ONTARIO LTD.	2	\$118,080.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	2	\$113,472.00
					Ferrovial Services Canada Ltd	2	\$722,390.40
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	2	\$198,720.00
					Gazzola Paving Limited	2	\$282,528.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	2	\$125,069.76
					Pacific Paving Ltd	2	\$115,200.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	2	\$144,000.00
					ROA INC.	2	\$108,429.12
					Thorn tree Industries Ltd.	2	\$135,072.00

2021 - 2029 Winter Maintenance Services Contract

Item 4A - Articulated Loader Plow with Operator

Clarkson District

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
4A	Articulated Loader Plow with Operator	46	101	\$1,579,593.54			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	17	\$501,364.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	17	\$985,558.00
					A.I. ROADTECH SERVICES INC	17	\$758,914.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	17	\$650,743.00
					Buist Landscaping Inc.	5	\$408,752.05
					Ferrovial Services Canada Ltd	17	\$2,379,607.47
					Gazzola Paving Limited	17	\$1,152,107.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	17	\$944,350.00
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	17	\$888,616.18
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	17	\$827,576.83
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	17	\$664,479.00
					Pacific Paving Ltd	17	\$549,440.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	17	\$549,440.00
					ROA INC.	17	\$614,016.37
					Robert B. Meisner Construction Inc.	17	\$472,175.00

Mavis

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
4A	Articulated Loader Plow with Operator	10	101	\$343,389.90			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	10	\$294,920.00
					1942537 ONTARIO LTD.	10	\$282,800.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	10	\$529,240.00
					A.I. ROADTECH SERVICES INC	10	\$427,230.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	10	\$382,790.00
					bonum contracting	10	\$581,760.00
					Defina Haulage Ltd	10	\$420,048.90
					Ferrovial Services Canada Ltd	10	\$1,556,834.20
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	10	\$565,600.00
					Gazzola Paving Limited	10	\$716,090.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	10	\$459,550.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	10	\$497,606.80
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	10	\$390,870.00
					Pacific Paving Ltd	10	\$323,200.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	10	\$404,000.00
					ROA INC.	10	\$361,186.10
					Robert B. Meisner Construction Inc.	10	\$277,750.00

Malton

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
4A	Articulated Loader Plow with Operator	8	101	\$274,711.92			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	8	\$235,936.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	8	\$382,992.00
					A.I. ROADTECH SERVICES INC	8	\$339,360.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	8	\$306,232.00
					bonum contracting	8	\$465,408.00
					Ferrovial Services Canada Ltd	8	\$1,381,154.80
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	8	\$452,480.00
					Gazzola Paving Limited	8	\$590,648.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	8	\$366,832.00
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	8	\$331,578.96
					Maple-Crete Inc.	8	\$321,559.76
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	8	\$408,557.12
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	8	\$312,696.00
					Pacific Paving Ltd	8	\$258,560.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	8	\$282,800.00
					ROA INC.	8	\$288,948.88
					Robert B. Meisner Construction Inc.	8	\$222,200.00

Meadowdale

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
4A	Articulated Loader Plow with Operator	11	101	\$377,728.89			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	11	\$324,412.00
					A & G The Road Cleaners Ltd.	11	\$582,164.00
					A.I. ROADTECH SERVICES INC	11	\$457,732.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	11	\$421,069.00
					bonum contracting	11	\$639,936.00
					Ferrovial Services Canada Ltd	11	\$1,709,517.92
					Gazzola Paving Limited	11	\$833,250.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	11	\$611,050.00
					infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	11	\$470,919.57
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	11	\$547,789.66
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	11	\$429,957.00
					Pacific Paving Ltd	11	\$341,077.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	11	\$444,400.00
					ROA INC.	11	\$397,304.71
					Robert B. Meisner Construction Inc.	11	\$305,525.00

2021 - 2029 Winter Maintenance Services Contract

Item 5A - Sidewalk Machine with Operator

Clarkson District

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
5A	Sidewalk Machine with Operator	12	144	\$289,059.84			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	12	\$511,488.00
					2601448 Ontario Inc	12	\$535,680.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	12	\$571,968.00
					Buist Landscaping Inc.	10	\$414,720.00
					CSL Group Ltd	12	\$786,240.00
					Ferrovia Services Canada Ltd	12	\$2,005,240.32
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	12	\$993,600.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	12	\$475,200.00
					JARLIAN CONSTRUCTION INC.	12	\$1,083,456.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	12	\$298,944.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	12	\$527,040.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	12	\$1,209,600.00

Mavis

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
5A	Sidewalk Machine with Operator	27	144	\$650,384.64			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	27	\$1,150,848.00
					1942537 ONTARIO LTD.	10	\$285,120.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	27	\$1,353,024.00
					Ferrovia Services Canada Ltd	27	\$3,894,648.48
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	27	\$890,352.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	27	\$672,624.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	27	\$1,185,840.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	27	\$2,721,600.00

Malton

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
5A	Sidewalk Machine with Operator	25	144	\$602,208.00			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	25	\$1,065,600.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	25	\$1,252,800.00
					Ferrovia Services Canada Ltd	25	\$3,659,112.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	25	\$784,800.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	25	\$586,800.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	25	\$1,098,000.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	25	\$2,520,000.00

Meadowvale

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
5A	Sidewalk Machine with Operator	18	144	\$433,589.76			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	18	\$767,232.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	18	\$881,280.00
					Ferrovia Services Canada Ltd	18	\$2,758,510.08
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	18	\$1,490,400.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	18	\$686,880.00
					JARLIAN CONSTRUCTION INC.	18	\$1,371,168.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	18	\$422,496.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	18	\$790,560.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	18	\$1,814,400.00

## 2021 - 2029 Winter Maintenance Services Contract

### Item 6A -Manual Clearing of Bus Stops and Crossings with Driver/Labourer

#### Clarkson District

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
6A	Manual Clearing of Bus Stops	16	144	\$457,482.24			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	16	\$317,952.00
					ADCRO Group	4	\$115,200.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	16	\$569,088.00
					bonum contracting	16	\$499,968.00
					Buist Landscaping Inc.	16	\$368,640.00
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	16	\$864,000.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	16	\$426,240.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	16	\$327,168.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	16	\$391,680.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	16	\$806,400.00

#### Mavis

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
6A	Manual Clearing of Bus Stops	30	144	\$857,779.20			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	30	\$578,880.00
					ADCRO Group	4	\$115,200.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	30	\$1,067,040.00
					bonum contracting	30	\$1,023,840.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	30	\$624,240.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	30	\$613,440.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	30	\$972,000.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	30	\$1,944,000.00

#### Malton

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
6A	Manual Clearing of Bus Stops	27	144	\$772,001.28			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	27	\$520,992.00
					ADCRO Group	4	\$115,200.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	27	\$960,336.00
					bonum contracting	27	\$921,456.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	27	\$555,012.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	27	\$513,216.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	27	\$874,800.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	27	\$1,360,800.00

#### Meadowvale

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount
6A	Manual Clearing of Bus Stops	23	144	\$657,630.72			
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	23	\$447,120.00
					ADCRO Group	4	\$115,200.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	23	\$818,064.00
					bonum contracting	23	\$784,944.00
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	23	\$1,242,000.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	23	\$612,720.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	23	\$437,184.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	23	\$745,200.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	23	\$1,490,400.00

\*See evaluation with Item 7 as they must be considered together

2021 - 2029 Winter Maintenance Services Contract

Item 7A -Mechanical Snow Clearing of Bus Stops and Crossings with Driver/Labourer

Clarkson District

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount	Item 6 Standby Bid Amount	Total Standby Bid Amount Item 6 & 7
7A	Mechanical Clearing of Bus Stops and Crossings	16	101	\$320,872.96					
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	16	\$337,744.00	\$317,952.00	\$655,696.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	16	\$255,328.00	\$569,088.00	\$824,416.00
					bonum contracting	16	\$342,592.00	\$499,968.00	\$842,560.00
					Buist Landscaping Inc.	16	\$258,560.00	\$368,640.00	\$627,200.00
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	16	\$630,240.00	\$864,000.00	\$1,494,240.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	16	\$323,200.00	\$426,240.00	\$749,440.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	16	\$256,944.00	\$327,168.00	\$584,112.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	16	\$226,240.00	\$391,680.00	\$617,920.00
					ORIN CONTRACTORS CORP	16	\$363,600.00	\$0.00	\$363,600.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	16	\$606,000.00	\$806,400.00	\$1,412,400.00

Mavis

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount	Item 6 Standby Bid Amount	Total Standby Bid Amount Item 6 & 7
7A	Mechanical Clearing of Bus Stops and Crossings	30	101	\$601,636.80					
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	30	\$621,150.00	\$578,880.00	\$1,200,030.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	30	\$478,740.00	\$1,067,040.00	\$1,545,780.00
					bonum contracting	30	\$702,960.00	\$1,023,840.00	\$1,726,800.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	30	\$543,885.00	\$624,240.00	\$1,168,125.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	30	\$481,770.00	\$613,440.00	\$1,095,210.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	30	\$590,850.00	\$972,000.00	\$1,562,850.00
					ORIN CONTRACTORS CORP	30	\$636,300.00	\$0.00	\$636,300.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	30	\$1,136,250.00	\$1,944,000.00	\$3,080,250.00

Malton

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount	Item 6 Standby Bid Amount	Total Standby Bid Amount Item 6 & 7
7A	Mechanical Clearing of Bus Stops and Crossings	27	101	\$541,473.12					
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	27	\$561,762.00	\$520,992.00	\$1,082,754.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	27	\$430,866.00	\$960,336.00	\$1,391,202.00
					bonum contracting	27	\$632,664.00	\$921,456.00	\$1,554,120.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	27	\$463,590.00	\$555,012.00	\$1,018,602.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	27	\$406,323.00	\$513,216.00	\$919,539.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	27	\$531,765.00	\$874,800.00	\$1,406,565.00
					ORIN CONTRACTORS CORP	27	\$591,759.00	\$0.00	\$591,759.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	27	\$1,022,625.00	\$1,360,800.00	\$2,383,425.00

Meadowvale

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Standby Bid Amount	Item 6 Standby Bid Amount	Total Standby Bid Amount Item 6 & 7
7A	Mechanical Clearing of Bus Stops and Crossings	23	101	\$461,254.88					
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	23	\$480,861.00	\$447,120.00	\$927,981.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	23	\$367,034.00	\$818,064.00	\$1,185,098.00
					bonum contracting	23	\$538,936.00	\$784,944.00	\$1,323,880.00
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	23	\$905,970.00	\$1,242,000.00	\$2,147,970.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	23	\$464,600.00	\$437,184.00	\$901,784.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	23	\$346,127.00	\$874,800.00	\$1,220,927.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	23	\$452,985.00	\$745,200.00	\$1,198,185.00
					ORIN CONTRACTORS CORP	23	\$513,383.00	\$0.00	\$513,383.00
					Rafat General Contractor Inc.	23	\$871,125.00	\$1,490,400.00	\$2,361,525.00

2021 - 2029 Winter Maintenance Services Contract

Item 8 - Snow Removal & Application of De-icing Material Services for the Trelawny Lanes and Tenth Line Lanes

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Crews Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Crews Bid	Standby			Estimated Number of Snow events: 15cm or Less	Number of Crews Bid	Sub-Total	Operational			Total Operational Amount	Item 8 Bid Total		
							Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Standby Bid Amount	Sub-Total				Estimated Number of Snow Events: More than 15cm and 30cm or Less	Number of Crews Bid	Sub-Total				
8	Snow Removal Trelawny	2	101	\$91,756.48															
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	2	101	\$78,780.00	5	2	\$81,900.00	2	2	\$35,280.00	1	2	\$17,640.00	\$134,820.00	\$213,600.00
					Agua Tech Solutions Inc	2	101	\$176,346.00	5	2	\$96,430.00	2	2	\$34,056.00	1	2	\$15,556.00	\$146,042.00	\$322,388.00
					Buist Landscaping Inc.	2	101	\$28,280.00	5	2	\$90,000.00	2	2	\$55,000.00	1	2	\$28,000.00	\$1,714,000.00	\$1,742,280.00
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	2	101	\$125,240.00	5	2	\$45,000.00	2	2	\$36,000.00	1	2	\$24,000.00	\$105,000.00	\$230,240.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	2	101	\$92,920.00	5	2	\$75,000.00	2	2	\$30,000.00	1	2	\$15,000.00	\$120,000.00	\$212,920.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	2	101	\$181,800.00	5	2	\$20,988.00	2	2	\$16,790.40	1	2	\$12,594.80	\$50,373.20	\$232,173.20
					Robert B. Meisner Construction Inc.	2	101	\$101,000.00	5	2	\$250,000.00	2	2	\$20,000.00	1	2	\$10,000.00	\$280,000.00	\$381,000.00



2021 - 2029 Winter Maintenance Services Contract

Item 9 - Snow Removal & Application of De-icing Material Services for Various Locations

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Crews Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Crews Bid	Standby		Operational		Item 9 Bid Total	
							Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Standby Bid Amount	Estimated Curb Metres Per Crew	Number of Crews Bid		Operational Amount
9	Snow Removal Various Locations	9	101	\$492,023.52								
	614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction					3	101	\$88,779.00	5000	3	\$117,000.00	\$205,779.00
	1942537 ONTARIO LTD.					9	101	\$336,330.00	5000	9	\$225,000.00	\$561,330.00
	ADCRO Group					4	101	\$80,800.00	5000	4	\$2,200,000.00	\$2,280,800.00
	Aqua Tech Solutions Inc					3	101	\$68,478.00	5000	3	\$172,650.00	\$241,128.00
	bonum contracting					2	101	\$106,050.00	5000	2	\$165,000.00	\$271,050.00
	Buist Landscaping Inc.					3	101	\$37,875.00	5000	3	\$128,250.00	\$166,125.00
	CSL Group Ltd					1	101	\$123,725.00	5000	1	\$10,000.00	\$133,725.00
	Defina Haulage Ltd					1	101	\$70,700.00	5000	1	\$50,000.00	\$120,700.00
	Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.					2	101	\$64,640.00	5000	2	\$160,000.00	\$224,640.00
	Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.					2	101	\$135,340.00	5000	2	\$44,900.00	\$180,240.00
	Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.					3	101	\$89,385.00	5000	3	\$133,500.00	\$222,885.00
	Municipal Maintenance Inc					9	101	\$411,777.00	5000	9	\$413,550.00	\$825,327.00
	Pacific Paving Ltd					2	101	\$222,200.00	5000	2	\$100,000.00	\$322,200.00

2021 - 2029 Winter Maintenance Services Contract

Item 10A - MUT & Pathway Snow Clearing with Driver/Labourer

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Standby Bid Amount
10A	MUT & Pathway Snow Clearing	4	144	\$114,370.56				
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	4	144	\$91,008.00
					1942537 ONTARIO LTD.	4	144	\$54,720.00
					2601448 Ontario Inc	4	144	\$247,104.00
					ADCRO Group	4	144	\$115,200.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	4	144	\$113,472.00
					bonum contracting	4	144	\$97,056.00
					CSL Group Ltd	4	144	\$285,120.00
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	4	144	\$146,880.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	4	144	\$97,344.00
					JARLIAN CONSTRUCTION INC.	4	144	\$359,424.00
					Lima's Gardens & Construction Inc.	4	144	\$76,032.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	4	144	\$221,760.00
					Pacific Paving Ltd	4	144	\$132,480.00
					Robert B. Meisner Construction Inc.	4	144	\$112,320.00

## 2021 - 2029 Winter Maintenance Services Contract

## Item 11A - Residential Driveway Windrow Clearing Machine with Operator

## Clarkson District

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Standby Bid Amount
11A	Residential Driveway Windrow Clearing	46	101	\$1,579,593.54				
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	46	101	\$2,364,814.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	46	101	\$2,834,060.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	46	101	\$2,137,160.00
					Infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	46	101	\$1,488,671.32
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	46	101	\$1,575,923.20

## Mavis

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Standby Bid Amount
11A	Residential Driveway Windrow Clearing	68	101	\$2,335,051.32				
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	68	101	\$3,495,812.00
					1942537 ONTARIO LTD.	50	101	\$1,010,000.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	68	101	\$4,271,896.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	68	101	\$2,582,368.00
					Infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	68	101	\$1,727,302.00
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	68	101	\$2,315,752.24

## Malton

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Standby Bid Amount
11A	Residential Driveway Windrow Clearing	34	101	\$1,167,525.66				
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	34	101	\$1,751,340.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	34	101	\$2,029,494.00
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	34	101	\$2,129,080.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	34	101	\$1,236,240.00
					Infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	34	101	\$863,479.30
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	34	101	\$1,172,401.94

## Meadowvale

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Standby Bid Amount
11A	Residential Driveway Windrow Clearing	76	101	\$2,609,763.24				
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	76	101	\$3,899,408.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	76	101	\$4,966,372.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	76	101	\$3,653,776.00
					Infrastructure Maintenance Ltd	76	101	\$2,396,523.96
					Melrose Paving Co. Ltd.	76	101	\$2,584,739.48

2021 - 2029 Winter Maintenance Services Contract

Item 12A - Residential Sidewalk Machine with Operator

Clarkson District

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Standby Bid Amount
12A	Residential Sidewalk Machine with Operator	8	144	\$192,706.56				
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	8	144	\$395,136.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	8	144	\$355,968.00
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	8	144	\$564,480.00
					JARLIAN CONSTRUCTION INC.	8	144	\$1,025,280.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	8	144	\$334,080.00

Mavis

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Standby Bid Amount
12A	Residential Sidewalk Machine with Operator	12	144	\$289,059.84				
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	12	144	\$582,336.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	12	144	\$533,952.00
					Defina Haulage Ltd	12	144	\$587,520.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	12	144	\$380,160.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	12	144	\$623,808.00

Malton

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Standby Bid Amount
12A	Residential Sidewalk Machine with Operator	8	144	\$192,706.56				
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	8	144	\$395,136.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	8	144	\$355,968.00
					Defina Haulage Ltd	8	144	\$334,080.00
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	8	144	\$564,480.00
					Humberview Maintenance Group Ltd.	8	144	\$252,288.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	8	144	\$415,872.00

Meadowvale

Item	Description	Estimated Number of Units Required	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Estimated Cost	Contractor	Number of Units Bid	Number of Standby Days Per Unit	Standby Bid Amount
12A	Residential Sidewalk Machine with Operator	8	144	\$192,706.56				
					614128 Ontario Ltd o/a Trisan Construction	8	144	\$395,136.00
					Aqua Tech Solutions Inc	8	144	\$355,968.00
					Forest Ridge Landscaping Inc.	8	144	\$564,480.00
					JARLIAN CONSTRUCTION INC.	8	144	\$1,025,280.00
					Municipal Maintenance Inc	8	144	\$415,872.00

	2021 Contract	Current Contract 2019/2020
<b>Total Units</b>	67	43
<b>Total Cost (Operational and Standby)</b>	\$4,168,008	\$2,511,508.25
<b>Total Standby Days</b>	144	145
<b>Estimated Operational Hours</b>	200	200
<b>Operational Cost Per Unit/Hour</b>	\$72	\$61.63
<b>Average Standby Per Day Per Unit</b>	\$332	\$319.70

	2021 Contract	Current Contract 2019/2020
<b>Total Units</b>	74	64
<b>Total Cost (Operational and Standby)</b>	\$5,166,270.80	\$4,184,189.62
<b>Total Standby Days</b>	144	144
<b>Estimated Operational Hours</b>	200	200
<b>Operational Cost Per Unit/Hour</b>	\$74	\$66.77
<b>Average Standby Per Day Per Unit</b>	\$386	\$364.59

### Item 3: Combination Tri Axles

	2021 Contract	Current Contract 2019/2020	
<i>Total Units</i>	17	20	3
<i>Total Cost (Operational and Standby)</i>	\$ 1,212,718.92	\$739,493.90	\$24,266.55
<i>Total Standby Days</i>	144	103	
<i>Estimated Operational Hours</i>	200	50	35
<i>Operational Cost Per Unit/Hour</i>	\$76	\$66.77	\$240.22
<i>Average Standby Per Day Per Unit</i>	\$395.12	\$334.73	

### Item 4: Articulated Loaders

	2021 Contract	Current Contract 2019/2020
<i>Total Units</i>	46	21
<i>Total Cost (Operational and Standby)</i>	\$1,492,988	\$636,408.63
<i>Total Standby Days</i>	101	103
<i>Estimated Operational Hours</i>	50	65
<i>Operational Cost Per Unit/Hour</i>	\$70	\$69.40
<i>Average Standby Per Day Per Unit</i>	\$285.50	\$252.67

	<b>2021 Contract</b>	<b>Current Contract 2019/2020</b>
<b>Total Units</b>	82	73
<b>Total Cost (Operational and Standby)</b>	\$3,866,896	\$2,431,416.20
<b>Total Standby Days</b>	144	145
<b>Estimated Operational Hours</b>	200	200
<b>Operational Cost Per Unit/Hour</b>	\$68	\$74.73
<b>Average Standby Per Day Per Unit</b>	\$248	119.9

	<b>2021 Contract</b>	<b>Current Contract 2019/2020</b>
<b>Total Units</b>	96	77
<b>Total Cost (Operational and Standby)</b>	\$3,232,212	\$2,633,151.30
<b>Total Standby Days</b>	144	145
<b>Estimated Operational Hours</b>	200	120
<b>Operational Cost Per Unit/Hour</b>	\$65	\$56.49
<b>Average Standby Per Day Per Unit/Hour</b>	\$147.43	\$149.91

### Item 7: Mechanical Bus Stop Clearing

	2021 Contract	Current Contract 2019/2020
<b>Total Units</b>	96	77
<b>Total Cost (Operational and Standby)</b>	\$2,419,021	\$2,633,151.30
<b>Total Standby Days</b>	101	145
<b>Estimated Operational Hours</b>	110	120
<b>Operational Cost Per Unit/Hour</b>	\$68	56.49
<b>Average Standby Per Day Per Unit</b>	\$176.50	149.91

### Item 8: Trewlany Lanes Snow Removal

	2021 Contract	Current Contract 2019/2020
<b>Total Units</b>	2	2
<b>Total Cost (Operational and Standby)</b>	\$213,600	\$184,095.72
<b>Total Standby Days</b>	101	103
<b>Estimated Operational Events</b>		8
<b>Average Operational Cost Per Event</b>		\$7,088.95
<b>Average Standby Per Day Per Unit</b>	\$390	\$343.07



### Item 9: Various Locations Snow Removal

	2021 Contract	Current Contract 2019/2020
<b>Total Units</b>	9	7
<b>Total Cost (Operational and Standby)</b>	\$561,330	\$503,465.14
<b>Total Standby Days</b>	101	103
<b>Estimated Operational Curb Meters</b>	5000	5000
<b>Average Operational Cost Per Crew/ Per meter</b>	\$5	\$9.49
<b>Average Standby Per Day Per Unit</b>	\$370	\$238.64

### Item 10: MUT Pathway Clearing

	2021 Contract	Current Contract 2019/2020
<b>Total Units</b>	4	1
<b>Total Cost (Operational and Standby)</b>	\$106,720	26,680
<b>Total Standby Days</b>	144	144
<b>Estimated Operational Hours</b>	200	200
<b>Average Operational Cost Per Unit</b>	\$65.00	\$65
<b>Average Standby Per Day Per Unit</b>	\$95	\$95