



Corporation of the Municipality of Temagami

Report No.
2018-006

File No.

Subject:	Landfill Attendant Contracts
Agenda Date:	February 20, 2018
Attachments:	Copies of Memos 2017-M-033 and 2017-M-038, Resolutions 17-234 to 17-236

RECOMMENDATION

That Council receive report No. 2018-006 – Landfill Attendant Contracts; AND FURTHER THAT Council direct staff to proceed with alternative #_____.

BACKGROUND

Council reviewed two memorandums at its Regular Meeting on April 6, 2017 regarding Waste Management Contracts. Resolutions 17-234 and 235 were defeated and then Council passed resolution No. 17-236 directing that the contracts continue on a month to month basis until April 2018 that staff should meet with the contractors to renew the contracts and to work out the terms if necessary. Staff met with both landfill attendants separately to discuss the contracts in 2017. The CAO had started to prepare a memo to Council for the December 15, 2017 meeting to explain the status of the discussions with the contractors. The Analysis section below is taken from that draft memo.

ANALYSIS

The contractors both stated they are willing to extend the contracts until April 2018 but have both asked that they receive a 3% increase retroactively to the date the contracts initial term would have ended. The contracts initial term was scheduled to end on February 13, 2016 with the contracts continuing on a month to month basis from that point forward.

The contract for the Briggs Landfill and Lake Temagami Access Point Transfer Station Attendant is currently at \$23,755.89 per year. A 3% increase would bring the contract rate up to \$24,468.57, a difference of \$712.68.

The contract for the Dump Wagons at the lake Temagami Access Point and the Welcome Centre Transfer Station is currently at \$49.00 per load and includes attendance of the Welcome Centre Transfer Station, plus an additional \$25.00 per load for recycling.

The contract for the Strathy and Sisk Landfill Sites Attendant is currently at \$35,000 per year. A 3% increase would bring the contract rate up to \$36,050, a difference of \$1,050.

One of the contractors approached me as the Acting CAO in January for an update on this contract. Following some research, we met and I explained that since the terms discussed with the CAO were the same as the motion that had been defeated by Council, this matter would have to come back to Council before a draft by-law could be considered. As negotiations had already taken place with the CAO, the contractor was unwilling to change his position.

As mentioned in Memo 2017-M-038, if the Municipality did not terminate the agreement when it expired, that the agreement would continue **without any changes** until the contract was terminated or amended. This continuation was, however, reasonably anticipated by the contractor to be for only a few months, not for two years.

FINANCIAL/STAFFING IMPLICATIONS

This item has been approved in the current budget: Yes No N/A

This item is within the approved budgeted amount: Yes No N/A

Financial implications are noted in the Analysis section above.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Council could choose to reconsider Resolution 17-236 and agree to a 3% increase retroactive to the expiration of the contracts.
2. Council could choose to agree to a 3% increase retroactive to a later date, reflective of the fact that the original contract provided for continuation for an additional period without changes.
3. Council could choose to specify a percentage, or a range of percentages that Council is comfortable with directing staff to finalize with the contractors.

**Prepared and Submitted for
Council Consideration by:**

**Elaine Gunnell
Municipal Clerk / Acting CAO**
