

The performance of the successful supplier(s) will be evaluated on each criteria listed below.

Category: Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Project Lead	Project Manager is lacking in experience and people skills. Cannot organise project work or meet schedule timelines.		Competent and knowledgeable Project Manager, cooperative; normally available when required		Project Manager provides leadership and structure to project team. Team excels due to Project Manager.	Rating
Team Management	Fails to employ individuals or subcontractors who are skilled and suitable for the work.		Consultant employs individuals or subconsultants who are skilled and suitable for the work.		Consultant manages a cohesive team with superb skills and promotes a positive team environment.	Rating
Utility Coordination	Consultant does not coordinate in the timely manner with all utilities for the project, needs prompting by City Project Managers, misses utility right of ways or getting utility approvals, utility relocates or installations are not coordinated, impacts schedules and causes delays		Consultant adequately coordinate with all utilities for the project, utility right of way, getting utility approvals required, utility relocates or installations are coordinated		Consultant proactively identifies issues, coordinates and works with all utilities for the project, utility right of way, getting utility approvals required promptly, utility relocates or installations are coordinated	Rating
Risk Management	Consultant has no or ineffective risk management methodology. Must be led by City to perform risk analysis. Cannot identify risks or formulate mitigation strategies.		Consultant has a risk management methodology and is able to perform risk analysis. Works together with City to identify risks and provide mitigation strategy. Provides risk management report.		Consultant is a leader in risk management and is able to identify risks not considered by the city and provides a detailed and documented risk management report that contains well-developed mitigation strategies and maintained throughout the project.	Rating

Category: Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Staff Availability	Staff are rarely available, don't meet commitments and don't provide supplementary qualified resources when required. Staff assigned to the project are changed without notice to the City.		Staff listed in proposal are those working on the project or if staff leave the project, they are replaced with equally qualified and experienced staff approved by the City. Staff are available when required as stated in the signed agreement and will provide qualified supplementary resources when required		Staff listed in proposal are those working on the project. If staff leave the project, they are replaced with equally qualified and experienced staff approved by the City. Staff are available when required as stated in the signed agreement and will provide qualified supplementary resources when required. Access to firm's upper management is possible and achievable. All commitments are met	Rating
On-Site Superintendent	On-site superintendent appears to be inadequately trained, seldom on site when required, disorganised and uncooperative; Frequent superintendent and/or foreman turnover. Not familiar with specifications. Lacks authority to make decisions on behalf of the contractor		Competent and knowledgeable superintendent, cooperative; Competent and knowledgeable supervision, cooperative. Is on-site. Is able to make decisions and react to any situation on the project in a timely matter. Foreman are knowledgeable in assigning tasks when required		Superior superintendent. Has excellent knowledge of all trades. Anticipates problems and offers creative solutions. Has full authority to make decisions on behalf of the contractor. Took responsibility for subcontractors complying with contract requirements.	Rating
Company Management	Management has little to no knowledge of construction methods. Management does not fulfill its commitments even after prodding by the City. Fails to employ individuals or subcontractors who are skilled and suitable for the work.		Management understands all aspects of construction. Management consistently meets basic commitments regarding the contract.		Management has an advanced knowledge of construction methods and leading edge technologies. Offers innovative solutions.	Rating

Category: Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Customer Service/ Cooperation with the City	Contractor is unavailable and appears to avoid the City. Contractor consistently does not meet information milestone dates, is difficult to reach, and does not return any communications without a major effort from the customer(s). Respect of City as a customer(s) is non-existent.		Contractor is reliable and makes information available on request. Is timely and cooperative. Contractor meets established information milestone dates & demonstrates respect towards customer(s). Is easily reached & returns all communication efforts in a satisfactory timeframe. The City's needs as a customer are addressed promptly.		Contractor is an industry leader, and looks to improve the relationship with the City. Always helpful in problem solving. Contractor exceeds all customer(s) communication standards, timelines & customer service levels are addressed in a team environment without delay.	Rating
Interaction with the Public	Interactions between the public and the contractor are mostly of the negative variety or not addressed. Many public complaints about contractor received by City officials. Contractor does not interact well, disputes must be settled by City.		Contractor is able to respond reasonably & in a timely fashion on the majority of issues; is friendly/cooperative. City informed only on major issues or disputes.		The contractor keeps the public well informed of the project using information bulletins & signs. Notifies the public of changes in schedule; quick response to all public inquiries. Contractor makes effort to reduce impact project has on the public & is friendly/cooperative to the public. The City receives verbal or written accolades of the contractor's performance.	Rating
Project Manager / Contract Administration - Submittals	Submittals (minutes, shop drawings, manuals, as built, test results, proposed change orders and invoices) are late, poorly formatted, contain errors, or are not properly reviewed.		Submittals (minutes, shop drawings, manuals, as built, test results, proposed change quotations, invoices) are issued promptly, in the correct format, with no errors, and are reasonable.		Submittals (minutes, shop drawings, manuals, as built, test results, proposed change quotations and invoices) are issued promptly and require no review time. Costs are never questioned on change pricing.	Rating
Deficiency Clean Up	Deficiencies are argued each instance. Deficiencies are not assigned and/or drag on. No review of work prior to calling for inspection. Formal inspections identify excessive deficiencies.		Deficiencies are easily accepted, assigned for action, and promptly dealt with. Inspects the work prior to calling for inspection. Limited number of deficiencies.		Deficiencies are handled with little or no involvement from the City. Only a few minor deficiencies noted during formal inspection	Rating

Category: Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Change Orders (extras and force accounts)	Consistently looking to up-charge with numerous unjustified contractor-requested Change Orders. Credits are not identified or provided.		Extra fees are based on reasonable additional services provided. Contractor-requested Change Orders are detailed, realistic and justified. Credits are identified and given.		Uses discretion in requesting Change Orders. Any contractor-requested Change Order is detailed, realistic and justified. Credits are identified and given.	Rating

Category: Schedule

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Progress Reporting	Progress reporting is poor or non-existent.		Timely and accurate progress reporting.		Progress reports highlight areas for improvements and provide plans to improve.	Rating
Delivery of Services and Deliverables	Services and deliverables are delayed or of poor quality, resulting in requirement to re-submit. 50% (or less) of design executed by Consultant is completed on time (excluding delays out of the Consultant's control)		On-schedule delivery of services and deliverables in every stage. 100% of design completed on schedule (excluding delays out of the Consultant's control)		All services and deliverables are delivered promptly, with excellent quality. 100% of the design completed ahead of schedule (excluding delays out of the Consultant's control)	Rating
Overall Schedule	75% (or less) of work executed by Contractor is completed on time (excluding delays out of the Contractor's control). Mobilization is lengthy and unorganized. Failed to provide schedule until demanded by the City. Schedule did not comply with contract requirements. Had to be resubmitted numerous times until accepted by City. Failed to update schedule/cash flows during the project. Cash flow projections were unrealistic.		100% of work completed on schedule excluding deficiencies (excluding delays out of the Contractor's control). Mobilization is accomplished quickly. Contractor's schedule was submitted prior to the start of work and included all required work elements. Schedule and cash flow updated when required. Delays in the completion of the work were only a result of Force Majeure.		100% of the work completed ahead of schedule. Schedule exceeded contract requirements. Identified critical path. Weather allowances reflected seasonal averages. Identified milestones, utility work, critical material deliveries and shop drawing review periods. Responded to recover schedule slippages to meet schedule dates.	Rating

Category: Schedule

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Work Planning (including subcontractors)	Contractor exhibits a continuous lack of day to day work planning ability; inefficient use of equipment and manpower. Does not provide a look ahead schedule.		Contractor is competent at daily work planning; utilizes manpower and equipment in an efficient manner. Look ahead schedule is usually correct. Usually involves major subcontractors.		Accurate look ahead at schedule. Subtrades and suppliers involved in formulation of schedule.	Rating
Unjustified Delay (# of weeks)						Quantity

Category: Cost Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Budget Management	<p>Consultant allows budget to get out of hand, does not consider how changes due to design development will affect overall project budget.</p> <p>Consultant is not able to maintain a good balance between scope, quality, schedule and budget. Is unable to provide good advice to the City on proposed scope changes</p>		<p>Management of design development within cost plan. Timeliness of estimating and monitoring. Issues related to cost identified in the time requested by the City,</p> <p>Consultant is able to maintain a sound balance between scope, quality, schedule and budget. Is able to provide good advice to the City on proposed scope changes.</p>		<p>Consultant has good change management process. Design development and scope change estimates are continually updated, trend identified, and forecasts reported routinely. Alternative cost solutions are presented.</p> <p>Consultant is able to anticipate scope changes and acts upon them before they become an issue. Is able to maintain an excellent balance between scope, quality, schedule and budget. Is able to provide good advice to the City on proposed scope changes.</p>	Rating

Category: Cost Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Accuracy of Estimated Design Fees/Fee Management	Poor monitoring and reporting of actual time spent versus budgeted. Actual fees (outside of scope changes) are over 20% higher than original estimate.		Good monitoring and reporting of actual time spent versus budgeted. Actual fees (outside of scope changes) are within 10% of original estimate.		Excellent monitoring and reporting of actual time spent versus budgeted. Actual fees (outside of scope changes) are within 1% of original estimate. Estimates include provisions to adjust productivity factors to improve accuracy, knowledgeable about current economic conditions, industry trends	Rating
Accuracy of Estimating Prelim and Construction Tender Costs (This criteria is only applicable if the tender occurs within a reasonable time following the estimate.)	Tender costs (outside of scope changes) are significantly outside the accuracy range as detailed in the PSA Description of Work. Estimates do not include all factors and are not accurate.		Tender costs (outside of scope changes) are comprehensive and within the required accuracy range as detailed in PSA Description of Work.		Tender costs (outside of scope changes) are very close to the estimate. Estimates include provisions to adjust productivity factors to improve accuracy, knowledgeable about current economic conditions, and industry trends.	Rating
Accuracy of Estimating Construction Quantities	Actual quantities (outside of scope changes) are significantly outside the accuracy range as detailed in the PSA. Estimates do not include all factors and are not accurate.		Consultant provides detailed bills of materials and unit prices are accurate. Construction quantities (outside of scope changes) are within the required accuracy range as detailed in PSA.		Consultant provides detailed bills of materials and unit prices are accurate. Actual quantities (outside of scope changes) are very close to the estimate as detailed in the PSA.	Rating
Invoice Administration	Invoices are late (causing extra work at year end), poorly formatted or contain errors and inadequate details. Progress claims and proposed change costing are unreasonable. Claims for disbursements not included in the agreement. No review by Prime Consultant on disbursement claims.		Invoices are issued within the prescribed timelines, in an acceptable format, with minimal errors and provide the appropriate background documentation. Only disbursements allowed under the Agreement are charged. Claims from sub-consultants reviewed by Prime Consultant before submittal to City.		Invoices are submitted promptly to the appropriate individual for processing; are clear, complete and accurate; require little review time and are in an acceptable format with all required supporting documentation. Claims are well documented, requiring minimal review by the City.	Rating

Category: Cost Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Consultant Evaluation of Contractor Change Requests and invoicing	<p>Takes an unreasonable amount of time and reviews do not accurately reflect what is in contract documents</p> <p>Does not exercise ability to reject Contractor claimed extras when inappropriate.</p>		<p>Reviews are done accurately and in a reasonable time and identifies where change order requests are covered under existing contract requirement.</p> <p>Consultant rejects Contractor claimed extras when required. Consultant has the ability to make decisive actions in providing Site instructions, and design change management during construction.</p>		<p>Reviews are done accurately and in a prompt manner and identifies where change order requests are covered under existing contract requirement. Evaluates and proposes alternates that improve on methodology, schedule or budget.</p>	Rating
Change Orders (extras and force accounts)	Consistently looking to up-charge with numerous unjustified Change Order Requests.		Extra fees are based on reasonable additional services provided. Contractor-requested Change Orders are detailed and realistic.		Uses discretion in requesting Change Orders. Holds the prices for additional work requested in Change Orders. Any consultant-requested Change Order is detailed and justified.	Rating

Category: Bridge Construction Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Compliance with Specifications	Contractor has no familiarity with the City specs and no attempt to improve		Contractor is knowledgeable of the City specs that are relevant to the contract scope		Contractor recommends improvements to specs where appropriate	Rating
Contractor Equipment	Contractor has outdated equipment that is not maintained - numerous breakdowns		Contractor's equipment meets industry standards and intent of contract - has a preventative maintenance program - few breakdowns		Contractor uses highest quality equipment and has a preventative maintenance program - no breakdowns	Rating

Category: Bridge Construction Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Workmanship	Contractor lacks the ability to perform contract work, they are unfamiliar with the proper methods and do not have the correct tools for the job, requires City supervision when performing work.		Work is of acceptable quality; installations are within specified allowances.		Work is of the highest quality; contractor has high standards for performing tasks; installations are always correct	Rating
Testing	More than 15% of work that is inspected results in a rejection or rework.		No more than 5% of work that is inspected results in a rejection or rework.		No work is rejected or requires rework.	Rating
Granular Material	Contractor requires retesting on more than 20% of granular material; puts no effort into obtaining the optimum moisture for compaction		Contractor requires retesting on not more than 10% of granular material; a consistent effort is put into obtaining the optimum moisture		Contractor exceeds minimum densities for compaction; granular material is always conditioned properly for optimum moisture	Rating
Concrete - Workmanship	Contractor lacks the ability to finish concrete, they are unfamiliar with the process and does not have the correct tools for the job; requires City supervision when setting forms.		Finishing is of acceptable quality; concrete elevations are within specified allowances and provides positive drainage.		Finishing is of the highest quality; contractor has high standards for finishing and removes poorly finished concrete without being required by the City; elevations are always correct	Rating
Concrete - Testing	More than 15% of trucks that are tested result in a rejection or onsite adjustment of the mix, more than 5% of concrete strength tests fail.		No more than 5% of trucks that are tested result in a rejection or onsite adjustment of the mix, not more than 5% of concrete strength tests fail.		No trucks are rejected or require onsite adjustment of the mix and meets the compressive strength test requirement.	Rating
Asphalt - Workmanship	Asphalt has cracked surface and large areas of segregation, large areas required removal and replacement. Contractor puts asphalt that has already been through the paver back in the hopper. Contractor makes no attempts to prevent temperature segregation.		Asphalt surface has minimal cracking and small areas of segregation which did not require removal and replacement. Contractor does not reuse asphalt that has been through the paver. Contractor makes some attempts at preventing temperature segregation. Provides positive drainage.		Asphalt surface is free from cracks and has no areas of segregation. Contractor does not reuse asphalt that has been through the paver, takes proactive measures to preventing temperature segregation, brings new methods of construction to the City and is a partner in developing paving best practices.	Rating

Category: Bridge Construction Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Asphalt - Testing	Contractor had more than 15% of asphalt density test results below specified, Contractor's asphalt plant was required to shutdown and adjust their mix design to bring it back within acceptable mix tolerance limits.		Contractor had between 5% - 10% of asphalt density test results below specified, not more than 5% of marshal results were outside acceptable mix tolerance limits, no mix adjustment necessary.		Contractor had no asphalt density test results below specified, all Marshall test results are acceptable and meet the mix tolerance limits.	Rating
Miscellaneous Contract Components	Contractor neglects to complete smaller contract components even after requests from the City		Contractor completes smaller contract components within an acceptable amount of time, work is of acceptable quality		Contractor completes smaller contract components immediately, work is of the highest quality	Rating
Handling of Issues	Contractor reacts negatively to quality concerns		Contractor responds to quality concerns when identified		Contractor resolves quality issues on their own initiative	Rating
Painting / Coating including removal, preparation, application	Contractor lacks the ability to perform contract work. They are unfamiliar with the proper methods and/or do not have the correct tools for the job. Requires constant City supervision and/or advice when performing work.		Work is of acceptable quality; installations are within specified allowances. Issues resolved only after identification by the City.		Work is of the highest quality; contractor has high standards for performing tasks; installations are correct. Works with the City towards innovations and/or new processes.	Rating
Material Fabrication and Inspection	Continuous supervision required to enforce the quality provisions of the contract. The contractor reacts negatively to quality concerns.		Meets minimum requirements. Contractor responds to quality concerns when identified.		Exceeds minimum requirements and provides an excellent product. Contractor resolves quality issues on own initiative. Works with the City towards innovations and/or new processes.	Rating
Installation of Bridge deck joints, strip seals, bearings, bridge rail, handrail	Contractor lacks the ability to perform contract work. They are unfamiliar with the proper methods and/or do not have the correct tools for the job. Requires constant City supervision and/or advice when performing work.		Work is of acceptable quality; installations are within specified allowances. Issues resolved only after identification by the City.		Work is of the highest quality; contractor has high standards for performing tasks; installations are correct. Works with the City towards innovations and/or new processes.	Rating

Category: Buildings Construction Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Site work	Continuous supervision required to enforce the quality provisions of the contract. The contractor reacts negatively to quality concerns.		Meets minimum requirements. Contractor reacts to quality concerns when identified. Contractor has acceptable quality assurance program.		Exceeds expectations. Contractor resolves quality issues on its own initiative.	Rating
Superstructure	Continuous supervision required to enforce the quality provisions of the contract. The contractor reacts negatively to quality concerns.		Meets minimum requirements. Contractor reacts to quality concerns when identified. Contractor has acceptable quality assurance program.		Exceeds expectations. Contractor resolves quality issues on its own initiative.	Rating
Interior Finishes	Continuous supervision required to enforce the quality provisions of the contract. The contractor reacts negatively to quality concerns.		Meets minimum requirements. Contractor reacts to quality concerns when identified. Contractor has acceptable quality assurance program.		Exceeds expectations. Contractor resolves quality issues on its own initiative.	Rating
Building Envelope	Continuous supervision required to enforce the quality provisions of the contract. The contractor reacts negatively to quality concerns.		Meets minimum requirements. Contractor reacts to quality concerns when identified. Contractor has acceptable quality assurance program.		Exceeds expectations. Contractor resolves quality issues on its own initiative.	Rating
Mechanical	Continuous supervision required to enforce the quality provisions of the contract. The contractor reacts negatively to quality concerns.		Meets minimum requirements. Contractor reacts to quality concerns when identified. Contractor has acceptable quality assurance program.		Exceeds expectations. Contractor resolves quality issues on its own initiative.	Rating
Electrical	Continuous supervision required to enforce the quality provisions of the contract. The contractor reacts negatively to quality concerns.		Meets minimum requirements. Contractor reacts to quality concerns when identified. Contractor has acceptable quality assurance program.		Exceeds expectations. Contractor resolves quality issues on its own initiative.	Rating
Special Construction	Continuous supervision required to enforce the quality provisions of the contract. The contractor reacts negatively to quality concerns.		Meets minimum requirements. Contractor reacts to quality concerns when identified. Contractor has acceptable quality assurance program.		Exceeds expectations. Contractor resolves quality issues on its own initiative.	Rating

Category: Drainage Construction Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Compliance with Specifications	Contractor has no familiarity with the City specs and no attempt to improve		Contractor is knowledgeable of the City specs that are relevant to the contract scope		Contractor recommends improvements to specs where appropriate	Rating
Contractor Equipment	Contractor has outdated equipment that is not maintained - numerous breakdowns		Contractor's equipment meets industry standards and intent of contract - has a preventative maintenance program - few breakdowns		Contractor uses highest quality equipment and has a preventative maintenance program - no breakdowns	Rating
Contractor Supplied Materials	Contractor obtains cheapest materials available, puts no effort into obtaining better quality materials		Contractor obtains acceptable materials, a consistent effort is put into obtaining good materials.		Contractor exceeds specifications for materials. Materials are of the highest quality.	Rating
Workmanship	Contractor lacks the ability to perform contract work, they are unfamiliar with the proper methods and do not have the correct tools for the job, requires City supervision when performing work.		Work is of acceptable quality; installations are within specified allowances.		Work is of the highest quality; contractor has high standards for performing tasks; installations are always correct	Rating
Testing	More than 15% of work that is inspected results in a rejection or rework.		Less than 5% of work that is inspected results in a rejection or rework.		No work is rejected or requires rework.	Rating

Category: Landscape Construction Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
On-Site Construction	Contractor requires continuous supervision to ensure quality workmanship is obtained, quality construction non existent & reacts negatively when informed of quality issues.		Meets minimum contractual requirements. Contractor reacts to quality concerns when identified in an acceptable time frame.		Contractor exceeds expectations & demonstrates an excellent probability of success. Contractor resolves quality issues without City direction in a quick fashion.	Rating

Category: Landscape Construction Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Landscaping Products	Plant material, topsoil, bark mulch, & other specified materials delivered to site fail to meet contract specifications.		Plant material, topsoil, bark mulch & other specified materials meet minimum contract specifications and are generally acceptable. Product replacements are replaced.		Landscaping products are of specimen quality, soils & mulch exceed specifications. Contractor resolves product quality issues without City direction.	Rating
Testing (Grass Seed STC, Soil tests, Mulch. Sub-grade Inspections, Compaction)	More than 15% of work that is inspected results in a rejection or rework; Failure to provide Test Certificates		No more than 5% of work that is inspected results in a rejection or rework; Test Certificates provided		No work is rejected or requires rework; All Test Certificates provided in advance of work commencing and, where possible attached to Tender package.	Rating
Compliance with Specifications (includes As-Builts)	Contractor has no familiarity with the City specs and no attempt to improve: No As-builts provided		Contractor is knowledgeable of the City specs that are relevant to the contract scope; As-builts provided as per Contract		Contractor recommends improvements to specs where appropriate: Multiple copies of complete accurate As-Builts were provided as soon as work was completed in multiple formats (digital and Red-Line drawings).	Rating
Contractor Equipment	Contractor has outdated equipment that is not maintained - numerous breakdowns		Contractor's equipment meets industry standards and intent of contract - has a preventative maintenance program - few breakdowns		Contractor uses highest quality equipment and has a preventative maintenance program - no breakdowns	Rating

Category: Land Servicing Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Compliance with Specifications	Contractor has no familiarity with the City specs and no attempt to improve		Contractor is knowledgeable of the City specs that are relevant to the contract scope		Contractor recommends improvements to specs where appropriate	Rating

Category: Land Servicing Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Contractor Equipment	Contractor has outdated equipment that is not maintained - numerous breakdowns		Contractor's equipment meets industry standards and intent of contract - has a preventative maintenance program - few breakdowns		Contractor uses highest quality equipment and has a preventative maintenance program - no breakdowns	Rating
Workmanship	Contractor lacks the ability to perform contract work, they are unfamiliar with the proper methods and do not have the correct tools for the job, requires City supervision when performing work.		Work is of acceptable quality; installations are within specified allowances.		Work is of the highest quality; contractor has high standards for performing tasks; installations are always correct	Rating
Quality Control - Testing	More than 15% of work that is inspected results in a rejection or rework.		No more than 5% of work that is inspected results in a rejection or rework.		No work is rejected or requires rework.	Rating
Miscellaneous Contract Components (e.g. landscaping, paving stones, etc.)	Contractor neglects to complete smaller contract components even after requests from the City		Contractor completes smaller contract components within an acceptable amount of time, work is of acceptable quality		Contractor completes smaller contract components immediately, work is of the highest quality	Rating
Handling of Issues	Contractor reacts negatively to quality concerns		Contractor responds to quality concerns when identified		Contractor resolves quality issues on his own initiative	Rating

Category: Roads Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Compliance with Specifications	Contractor has no familiarity with the City specs and no attempt to improve		Contractor is knowledgeable of the City specs that are relevant to the contract scope		Contractor recommends improvements to specs where appropriate	Rating
Contractor Equipment	Contractor has outdated equipment that is not maintained - numerous breakdowns		Contractor's equipment meets industry standards and intent of contract - has a preventative maintenance program - few breakdowns		Contractor uses highest quality equipment and has a preventative maintenance program - no breakdowns	Rating

Category: Roads Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Workmanship	Contractor lacks the ability to perform contract work, they are unfamiliar with the proper methods and do not have the correct tools for the job, requires City supervision when performing work.		Work is of acceptable quality; installations are within specified allowances.		Work is of the highest quality; contractor has high standards for performing tasks; installations are always correct	Rating
Testing	More than 15% of work that is inspected results in a rejection or rework.		No more than 5% of work that is inspected results in a rejection or rework.		No work is rejected or requires rework.	Rating
Granular Material	Contractor requires retesting on more than 20% of their granular material, puts no effort into obtaining the optimum moisture for compaction		Contractor requires retesting on not more than 10% of granular material, a consistent effort is put into obtaining the optimum moisture		Contractor exceeds minimum densities for compaction, granular material is always conditioned properly for optimum moisture	Rating
Concrete - Workmanship	Contractor lacks the ability to finish concrete, they are unfamiliar with the process and does not have the correct tools for the job, requires City supervision when setting forms.		Finishing is of acceptable quality; concrete elevations are within specified allowances.		Finishing is of the highest quality; contractor has high standards for finishing and removes poorly finished concrete without being required by the City; elevations are always correct	Rating
Concrete - Testing	More than 15% of trucks that are tested result in a rejection or onsite adjustment of the mix, more than 5% of concrete strength tests fail.		No more than 5% of trucks that are tested result in a rejection or onsite adjustment of the mix, not more than 5% of concrete strength tests fail.		No trucks are rejected or require onsite adjustment of the mix and meets the compressive strength test requirement.	Rating
Asphalt - Workmanship	Asphalt has cracked surface and large areas of segregation, large areas required removal and replacement. Contractor puts asphalt that has already been through the paver back in the hopper. Contractor makes no attempt to prevent temperature segregation.		Asphalt surface has minimal cracking and small areas of segregation which did not require removal and replacement. Contractor does not reuse asphalt that has been through the paver. Contractor makes some attempts at preventing temperature segregation.		Asphalt surface is free from cracks and has no areas of segregation. Contractor does not reuse asphalt that has been through the paver. Contractor takes proactive measures to prevent temperature segregation. Contractor brings new methods of construction to the City and is a partner in developing paving best practices.	Rating

Category: Roads Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Asphalt - Testing	Contractor had more than 15% of asphalt density test results below specified, Contractor's asphalt plant was required to shutdown and adjust their mix design to bring it back within acceptable mix tolerance limits.		Contractor had between 5% - 10% of asphalt density test results below specified, not more than 5% of marshal results were outside acceptable mix tolerance limits, no mix adjustment necessary.		Contractor had no asphalt density test results below specified; all Marshall test results are acceptable and meet the mix tolerance limits.	Rating
Miscellaneous Contract Components (i.e. Landscaping, paving stones, private tie-in's etc.)	Contractor neglects to complete smaller contract components even after requests from the City		Contractor completes smaller contract components within an acceptable amount of time, work is of acceptable quality		Contractor completes smaller contract components immediately, work is of the highest quality	Rating
Handling of Issues	Contractor reacts negatively to quality concerns		Contractor responds to quality concerns when identified		Contractor resolves quality issues on its own initiative	Rating
Structural (if >15% of contract value)	Continuous supervision required to enforce the quality provisions of the contract. The contractor reacts negatively to quality concerns.		Meets minimum requirements. Contractor responds to quality concerns when identified.		Exceeds minimum requirements and provides an excellent product. Contractor resolves quality issues on own initiative. Works with the city towards innovations and/or new processes'	Rating
Drainage (if >15% of contract value)	Contractor lacks the ability to perform contract work. They are unfamiliar with the proper methods and/or do not have the correct tools for the job. Requires constant City supervision and/or advice when performing work.		Work is of acceptable quality; installations are within specified allowances. Issues resolved only after identification by the City.		Work is of the highest quality; Contractor has high standards for performing tasks; installations are correct. Works with the City towards innovations and/or new processes.	Rating

Category: Waste Construction Quality

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Contractor Equipment	Contractor has outdated equipment that is not maintained - numerous breakdowns		Contractor's equipment meets industry standards and intent of contract - has a preventative maintenance program - few breakdowns		Contractor uses highest quality equipment and has a preventative maintenance program - no breakdowns	Rating
Contractor Supplied Materials	Contractor obtains cheapest materials available, puts no effort into obtaining better quality materials		Contractor obtains acceptable materials, a consistent effort is put into obtaining good materials.		Contractor exceeds specifications for materials. Materials are of the highest quality.	Rating
Workmanship	Contractor lacks the ability to perform contract work, they are unfamiliar with the proper methods and do not have the correct tools for the job, requires City supervision when performing work.		Work is of acceptable quality; installations are within specified allowances.		Work is of the highest quality; contractor has high standards for performing tasks; installations are always correct	Rating
Testing	More than 15% of work that is inspected results in a rejection or rework.		No more than 5% of work that is inspected results in a rejection or rework.		No work is rejected or requires rework.	Rating

Category: Landscape Establishment - Contractor

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Quality Control	Contractor lacks the ability to perform contract maintenance activities. They are unfamiliar with the proper methods & do not have the correct tools/equipment for the job. May only undertake 1 or 2 aspects of the work per month. Dead plant material continually exists on-site with no effort to replace.		Work is of acceptable quality and all aspects of maintenance are addressed without issue. Dead plant material is replaced on a regular basis as per contract requirements.		Work is of the highest quality. All aspects of maintenance are undertaken quickly and efficiently to standards above expectations. Plant health, City's contract administration issues & the public perception of the company's maintenance program is of primary importance to the contractor. Complete team working environment between the contractor & the City is maintained at all times.	Rating
Contract Administration	Maintenance Logs are vague, non-realistic and amateurish. Invoices are inaccurate, illegible, submitted very late or before work completed. Numerous change orders. Substitutions are requested. Contractor fails to attend required meetings and is difficult to reach.		Maintenance Logs submitted are deemed acceptable. Invoices contain few errors and are submitted on a regular basis in the prescribed format. Change Orders and substitutions are asked for occasionally. Contractor attends required meetings. Contractor can be reached when required.		Contractor provides updated accurate Maintenance Logs in both digital and hard copy. Invoices are provided as per Contract specifications in electronic format and are complete and accurate. Change Orders and requests for Substitutions are only asked for if serious issue arises. Contractor attends meetings well prepared with the appropriate personnel and information, can be reached at any time and responds immediately to e-mail, phone, and fax.	Rating
Time Management	Contractor fails to follow approved schedule, often does not show up on-site during scheduled times. Performs duties in an inefficient and time-consuming manner with major conflicts with traffic, user groups and special events.		Contractor generally follows approved schedule. Duties are performed in a generally efficient manner with few conflicts with traffic, user groups and special events.		Contractor follows approved schedule at all times and provides an exceptional level of on-site maintenance above contractual requirements. Performs all duties quickly and efficiently with no conflicts with traffic, user groups or special events.	Rating

Category: Design Services - Construction Consultant

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Innovation	Design shows no innovation.		Design shows some innovation within project requirements and constraints.		Design is recognized as a new paradigm for projects of this type.	Rating
Adherence to Project Guidelines, Scope of Work and Standards (including safety) where the Scope of Work has been defined	Consultant has no understanding of guidelines, scope of work, and standards; or chooses to ignore requirements		Consultant fully understands and incorporates guidelines, scope of work, and standards. Concept Planning specific: Consultant's ability to negotiate and incorporate changes due to regulatory requirements, on time and on schedule and at cost.		Consultant recommends and demonstrates improvements to guidelines, scope of work, and standards that reduces budget	Rating
Design Elegance through EDC Response	Functional re-design determination		EDC support with conditions		EDC full support without conditions	Rating
In-field Design During Construction	In excess of 3 days, impacts contractor schedule and many iterations (increased survey costs)		Completed in 3 days and no more than two iterations		Good on first iteration - no change required and completed in 3 days.	Rating
Ability to Manage/Cope with Change	<p>Consultant is unable to manage/cope with changes in project direction, extensive City staff intervention is required in order to complete the project.</p> <p>Consultant has no understanding of scope of work and standards, extensive assumptions without any contingency or risk mitigation strategy in place.</p>		<p>Consultant is able to manage/cope with changes in project direction, adjust resources and work plan to address final required outcomes of project.</p> <p>Consultant fully understands scope of work and standards, and manages project within budget, risk management strategy in place.</p>		<p>Consultant continually monitors their change & risk management plans, makes recommendations in order to meet required outcomes (including fundamental shifts in project direction).</p> <p>Consultant recommends and demonstrates improvements to scope of work and standards that reduces budget.</p>	Rating
Coordination of Circulation and Stakeholder Consultation on Design	Does not consider any provided comments. City had to ask multiple times for the revisions and comments. City had to intervene for comments/revisions to be incorporated		Obtains input from stakeholders, deals with comments and then optimizes and addresses appropriate comments into design		Comments are gathered, optimized and addressed quickly and appropriately	Rating

Category: Design Services - Construction Consultant

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Response to Questions	Responses are very late, contain multiple errors, are unclear (all requiring multiple callbacks and exchanges with contractor / stakeholders.		Responses to contractor / stakeholders are timely, accurate and clear with minimal callbacks.		Responses are immediate, accurate and clear with no callbacks required.	Rating
As-built Documentation and Record Drawings, and all Project Close-out Documentation	As-built documentation is late, and does not accurately reflect addendum and construction changes. Does not review or poorly reviews Service Manuals. Documentation is not in City format.		As-built documentation is provided within a reasonable time, with few errors and in City format. Reviews service manuals for completeness and follows up with Contractors on any issues.		As-built documentation is updated and provided promptly after construction in section or area is complete. Documentation is accurate, complete and in City format with no revisions. Demonstrates commitment to complete this aspect of the project.	Rating

Category: Quality - Construction Consultant

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Drawing Deliverables	Quality control of deliverables is poor. Drawings contain CAD errors and must be corrected numerous times.		Quality control of deliverables is good. Drawings have minor amount of errors.		Quality control of deliverables is excellent.	Rating
Report Deliverables	Reports are poorly formatted and contain grammatical and spelling errors		Reports are correctly formatted and contain a minimum of errors.		Reports are well formatted and contain none to minor errors.	Rating
Constructability of Design	Re-work required due to non-compliance to standards or design criteria. Issue an excessive number of RFI's. Specifies materials not available or tolerances that are not achievable		Complies to all standards and no re-work or re-engineering and a reasonable number of RFI's issued		Design can be constructed in a safe, timely and cost effective manner meeting all project objectives while providing a high quality product	Rating
Maintainability of the Design	Design poses maintenance difficulties and was not modified to meet the City's requirements.		Design adequately meets the City's requirements for maintainability.		Design provides ease of maintenance and exceeds City's requirements.	Rating

Category: Public Involvement

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Development of an Overall Public Involvement Plan (in accordance with the City's Public Involvement Directive)	<p>Consultant demonstrates little understanding of the overall project or issue complexity, scope, impact, context/history, and decision being made. Poorly conveys issues with stakeholders.</p> <p>Consultant demonstrates little understanding of the purpose and required outcomes from the public involvement process.</p> <p>Consultant is very slow in addressing the public involvement process and the plan is of very poor quality. Poor recognition of stakeholder sensitivities.</p>		<p>Consultant understands the overall project or issue complexity, scope, impact, context/history, and decision being made. Adequately conveys issues with stakeholders.</p> <p>Consultant demonstrates an understanding of the public involvement process and required outcomes.</p> <p>Consultant meets the scope requirements for the public involvement process and stakeholder sensitivities.</p>		<p>Consultant demonstrates comprehensive understanding of the overall project or issue complexity, scope, impact, context/history, and decision being made. Clearly conveys and proactively mitigates issues with stakeholders.</p> <p>Consultant has provided alternatives and methods in achieving the required outcomes for the public involvement process.</p> <p>Consultant has developed a public involvement plan that greatly exceeds project scope requirements and recognizes stakeholder sensitivities.</p>	Rating
Implementation of the Public Involvement Plan	<p>Consultant is unprepared and unorganized during the implementation of the public involvement process. Communication methods are incomplete and poorly targeted.</p>		<p>Consultant is prepared and organized during the public involvement process. Project communication methods are effective, complete, professionally prepared and communicated to the Public supporting good results</p>		<p>Consultant is well prepared and organized during the public involvement process. Provides added value to the communication process. Project communication methods are effective, complete, professionally prepared and communicated to the Public supporting best results.</p>	Rating
Evaluation of the Public Input, Comments and Required Project Follow up (including monitoring, if defined in project)	<p>Consultant is non receptive to providing follow up requirements. Does not provide final report or report is incomplete.</p>		<p>Consultant completes required follow up public involvement requirements and submits final report in a timely fashion</p>		<p>Evaluation of public involvement process is completed quickly providing additional alternatives for all aspects of public comments. Submits comprehensive final report in expedited fashion.</p>	Rating

Category: Construction Contract Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Project Schedule (excluding delays out of the Consultant's control)	Due to Consultant's inactions the project experienced significant delays, missing milestones and the completion date requiring increased project costs.		Consultant's actions and responses to questions were adequate with no resultant delay in meeting milestones or completion date.		Consultant's actions and responses to questions contributed to meeting all milestones and allowed for early project completion	Rating
Communication Skills (progress updates, etc.)	Consultant's communication required extensive or continuous intervention from City staff relative to timeliness, clarity or informing stakeholders.		Communication was satisfactory (in accordance with contract stated timelines, with clarity and stakeholders fully informed).		Communication was exceptional (immediate, comprehensive and positive feedback from stakeholders)	Rating
Response to Questions (technical, construction, etc)	Responses are very late, contain multiple errors, are unclear (all requiring multiple callbacks and exchanges with contractor / stakeholders.		Responses to contractor / stakeholders are timely, accurate and clear with minimal callbacks.		Responses are immediate, accurate and clear with no callbacks required.	Rating
Tender Document Preparation and Tender Process (Tender Assistance)	Consultant is not timely with tender document preparation, including unedited and incomplete specifications, special provisions, tender documents, excessive questions during tender period and slow answering questions during the tender period, do not add value to the evaluation process, numerous addendums.		Consultant is able to adequately prepare tender documents, including specification, special provisions, tender document preparation, answering questions during the tender period, assisting with evaluations, very few addendums.		Consultant prepares tender documents in a very timely manner, including carefully edited specification, special provisions, tender documents, documents generate very few questions but they are very responsive in answering those few questions during the tender period, minimum addendums during tender period, assistance in evaluation was invaluable.	Rating
Coordination of Site Activities	Poor coordination of site activities (Contractor, Staff, Utilities, City Department) requiring extensive intervention from City staff to resolve issues.		Satisfactory coordination of site activities (Contractor, Staff, Utilities, City Department) with timely resolution of any issues.		Exceptional coordination of site activities (Contractor, Staff, Utilities, City Department) with immediate resolution of issues along with proactive approach to prevent/mitigate issues in advance.	Rating

Category: Construction Contract Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Documentation	Extensive gaps and/or no documentation or late documentation of site activities or records of discussions/decisions with the Contractor.		Documentation of site activities and records of discussions/decisions with the Contractor satisfactorily maintained and timely		Exceptional, and timely, documentation of site activities (Daily Construction Progress Report and records of discussions/decisions with the Contractor).	Rating
Contract Quantity Control - Progress Payment Certificates (PPC)	Consultant has no change management process. Does not process progress claims in a timely manner or does not check actual progress in field. Requires significant City follow up to complete post construction services. Consultant does not adequately review PPC and certifies unchecked and un-rejected extras claimed by Contractor.		Consultant is able to adequately perform Contract Administration duties, including change management, processing progress claims, and resolving field issues, appropriately and timely completes post construction services. Consultant reviews, processes and certifies Contractor's Progress claims in a timely manner.		Consultant performs Contract Administration duties with little to no input from City. Handles change management, progress claims, and field issues independently. On their own initiative, appropriately and timely completes post construction services	Rating
Accuracy of Estimated Resident Engineering Fees (excluding impacts due to Contractors hours of work/duration)	Poor monitoring and reporting of actual time spent versus budgeted. Actual fees (outside of scope changes) are over 20% higher than estimate.		Good monitoring and reporting of actual time spent versus budgeted. Actual fees (outside of scope changes) are within 10% of estimate.		Excellent monitoring and reporting of actual time spent versus budgeted. Actual fees (outside of scope changes) are within 5% of estimate. Estimates include provisions to adjust productivity factors to improve accuracy, knowledgeable about current economic conditions, industry trends.	Rating
Pre-tender Estimating Accuracy	Tender costs (outside of scope changes) are significantly outside the accuracy range as detailed in the PSA Description of Work. Estimates do not include all factors and are not accurate.		Tender costs (outside of scope changes) are comprehensive and within the required accuracy range as detailed in PSA Description of Work.		Tender costs (outside of scope changes) are very close to the estimate. Estimates include provisions to adjust productivity factors to improve accuracy, knowledgeable about current economic conditions, and industry trends.	Rating

Category: Construction Contract Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Quality Assurance of Contractor's Work	Fails to do required quality assurance tests; or tests are too infrequent; too late, with little interpretation and/or otherwise of little value to the City.		Performs the required number of quality assurance tests, in a timely manner with results produced to the City in a reasonable time.		Anticipates and schedules all quality assurance tests in advance, and is flexible with working hours; performs the tests professionally to the required standards with minimal disruption to the work; and provides meaningful interpretation to the City in a very timely fashion, with recommendations to modify testing procedures or modify work procedures, if required.	Rating
Commissioning Services	When commissioning services are part of the Consultant's scope of work, the Consultant has no commissioning plan. Required resources are not planned for. Equipment is tested haphazardly, such that no systems are commissioned together. Poor or no documentation of commissioning results or issues. Does not provide proper servicing manuals. Does not meet or coordinates meetings with City operation staff to ensure knowledge transfer.		When commissioning services are part of the Consultant's scope of work, the Consultant is able to develop a workable commissioning plan that provides required testing, releases equipment to Operations in an efficient manner, and documents issues and proposes workable solutions. Provides proper servicing manuals. Meets or coordinates meetings with City operation staff to ensure knowledge transfer.		When commissioning services are part of the Consultant's scope of work, the Consultant develops a comprehensive plan that provides detailed testing, identifies resources, releases systems of equipment in an efficient manner, and documents commissioning results. Issues are clearly documented, excellent solutions provided immediately. Provides proper servicing manuals. Meets or coordinates meetings with City operation staff to ensure knowledge transfer.	Rating

Category: Environmental Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Sustainable Design	City must provide direction and expertise for certified and sustainable design. e.g. LEED Certification.		Has certified personnel, able to produce a certified and sustainable design. e.g. LEED Certification.		Provides leadership, and designs that exceeds appropriate certification and sustainable design e.g. LEED Certification.	Rating
Environmental Management (Engineering Design Services)	Not all environmental approvals/permits obtained prior to construction resulting in financial loss or delays in construction. Approved design does not consider or mitigate environmental impact. (As an example: Permanent erosion / sedimentation (ESC) plans inadequate or late.)		All environmental approvals/permits obtained prior to construction. Approved design mitigates the main environmental impacts of project (s). (As an example: Permanent erosion / sedimentation (ESC) plans follow best management practices and are delivered on time.)		All environmental approvals/permits obtained well before construction and are considered early. Approved design mitigates the main environmental impacts of project (s) and additional environmental initiatives have been integrated into the design. (As an example: Permanent erosion / sedimentation (ESC) plans follow best management practices and are delivered early.)	Rating

Category: Environmental Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Environmental Controls (Resident Engineering Services)	Consultant unsuccessfully manages the environmental components of the project. Inspections are not completed, environmental issues are not documented, environmental issues are not resolved in a timely manner, does not communicate environmental issues to stakeholders, does not support the environmental components of the project (e.g. remediation of contaminated sites, spills, on site erosion)		Consultant successfully manages the environmental components of the project. Required inspections are completed, environmental issues are documented, environmental issues are resolved in a timely manner, clearly communicates environmental issues to stakeholders, supports the required environmental components of the project (e.g. remediation of contaminated sites, spills, on site erosion)		Consultant successfully manages the environmental components of the project beyond expectations. Inspections are completed beyond requirements, environmental issues are documented and extra initiatives have been demonstrated to mitigate environmental impacts, Consultant has taken a leadership role to ensure environmental issues are resolved in a timely manner, excellent communication on environmental issues to stakeholders, supports the environmental components of the project and goes beyond the requirements. (e.g. remediation of contaminated sites, spills, on site erosion)	Rating
Environmental Design and Resource Conservation (including natural areas, wildlife, plant life and water)	Design does not consider the environment. Consultant fails to recognize, acknowledge or implement the conditions and provisions of the appropriate Municipal, Provincial or Federal policies and statutes. Has little knowledge or experience in applicable industry standards for design or construction techniques. Opinions presented may lead to prosecution.		Consultant shows commitment to environmental design. Has demonstrated a working knowledge of the appropriate Municipal, Provincial or Federal policies and statutes. Meets industry standards and recognizes site conditions that may affect resource conservation. Suggests appropriate Best Management practices (BMP) for construction and plant establishment activities.		Design exceeds environment expectations. Consultant is fully cognizant of the appropriate Municipal, Provincial or Federal policies and statutes and has demonstrated an effective working relationship with the affected agencies. Provides innovative solutions that meet the requirement of the policies and statutes which may lead to the upgrading of the BMP.	Rating

Category: Environmental Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Environmental Controls (Contractor's Responsibilities Package/ENVISO)	The environmental risks related to the contract were not properly controlled. Continued coaching did not rectify the environmental issues identified.		The environmental risks related to the contract were properly controlled and met the City's expectations.		The environmental risks related to the contract were properly controlled, exceeded the City's expectations and the Contractor demonstrated environmental leadership.	Rating
LEED Process: Documentation (Timelines and Accuracy of submissions)	Fails to meet LEED requirements. The contractor reacts negatively to LEED concerns. Late on document submissions.		Meets LEED requirements. Contractor reacts to LEED concerns when identified. Contractor has acceptable LEED submission timelines during construction.		Exceeds expectations, excellent probability of success. Contractor resolves LEED issues on its own initiative. Submits accurate documentation ahead of schedule.	Rating
LEED Process: Commissioning	Fails to meet LEED requirements. The contractor reacts negatively to LEED concerns and fails to coordinate LEED commissioning process.		Meets LEED requirements. Contractor reacts to LEED concerns when identified. Contractor has acceptable coordination of the LEED commissioning process.		Exceeds expectations, excellent probability of success. Contractor resolves LEED issues on its own initiative. Contractor completes coordination of LEED commissioning processes on own initiative.	Rating

Category: Safety

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Design Build Contractor Working Under COE Supervision (compliance with COE safety rules and evidence of staff safety training)	The Design Build Contractor's employees repeatedly fail to comply with safety rules established by City staff (i.e. wearing PPE, shortcutting safety procedures). Design Build Contractor places self or others in imminent danger (e.g. confined space entry without testing or training, working at heights without fall protection). Design Build Contractor fails to provide evidence of staff safety training required for the job (e.g. WHMIS or Fall Protection Training Certificate). Does not report all incidents including near misses in a timely manner. Does not work cooperatively with other contractors and employees		One or two of the Design Build Contractor's staff violate minor safety rules (i.e. non-imminent danger) or procedures but remedy situation quickly and does not repeat behaviour. Design Build Contractor initially fails to provide required safety training certificates, but stops work until evidence of training is provided and does not repeat behaviour. Reports all incidents and near misses in a timely manner. Work cooperatively with other contractors and employees.		Design Build Contractor staff follows all City safety rules and wears required PPE. Evidence of safety training provided before work begins.	Rating

Category: Safety

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
<p>Design Build Contractor Expected to Work Independently (an effective OHS management system that ensures safety of own staff)</p>	<p>Design Build Contractor fails to complete hazard assessment, develop/implement safe work procedures or train staff on hazards associated with work. The contractor's employees repeatedly fail to comply with safety rules they establish (i.e. wearing PPE, shortcutting safety procedures). Design Build Contractor staff places self or others in imminent danger (e.g. confined space entry without testing or training, working at heights without fall protection). Design Build Contractor fails to provide evidence of staff safety training required for the job (e.g. WHMIS or Fall Protection Training Certificate). Does not provide safety orientation to all subs and owner reps. Does not work cooperatively with other contractors and employees.</p>		<p>Design Build Contractor has done hazard assessments and developed/implemented safe work procedures but have missed something. They do regular safety inspections and occasionally find errors. They take corrective action immediately. If individual staff members violate rules repeatedly or seriously, the Design Build Contractor takes prompt action to remove individuals from the site. Minor safety violations occasionally occur but the Design Build Contractor takes prompt action to enforce safety rules. Design Build Contractor fails to provide evidence of staff safety training required for the job (e.g. WHMIS or Fall Protection Training Certificate). Reports all incidents and near misses in a timely manner.</p>		<p>Design Build Contractor does comprehensive hazard assessment and develops good safe work procedures. Safety inspections done by Design Build Contractor and project manager show safety practices consistently well done. Staff are well trained in required safety procedures and do not violate safety rules.</p>	<p>Rating</p>

Category: Safety

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Design Build Contractor Expected to Work As Project Prime Contractor (an effective OHS management system that ensures safety of own staff and ensures that other site contractors/employers comply with safety rules)	Design Build Contractor fails to establish a system: to orientate new contractors on safe work procedures, ensure the completion of hazard assessment, ensure compliance with safety rules, complete safety inspections, investigate incidents or follow-up on identified safety issues for any contractor working on site (including for their own staff). Does not provide safety orientation to all subs and owner reps. Does not work cooperatively with other contractors and employees.		Design Build Contractor has developed basic systems to check compliance with safety rules for all site contractors. Occasional gaps in compliance occur (e.g. subcontractor misses orientation, conflict in work scheduling results in inadvertent safety hazard to other contractor) but gaps show no negligence on the part of the prime contractor. Prime contractor takes prompt action to deal with gaps by addressing subcontractor safety performance issue. Provides safety orientation to all subs and owner reps. Reports all incidents and near misses in a timely manner. Works cooperatively with other contractors and employees.		Design Build Contractor has good systems to ensure all contractors on site receive orientation, comply with site safety rules, complete hazard assessments and implement controls. Prime contractor has comprehensive record of inspections and orientations given, shows that all safety issues are promptly dealt with. No significant gaps in systems so nobody on site is endangered and no subcontractors are allowed to take shortcuts on safety. Provided safety orientation to all subs and owner reps.	Rating
Design Build Contractor's COR status stayed good throughout contract (remained intact, clear of any COR review by Province, and, if applicable, successfully renewed during the contract).						Yes/No
Lost Time Claim Rate of Design Build Contractor at start of contract						Quantity
Number of Medical Aid Claims reported to WCB by Design Build Contractor (if any during contract)						Quantity
Number of Lost Time Claims reported to WCB by Design Build Contractor (if any during contract)						Quantity

Category: Safety

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Number of Province-issued Occupational Health and Safety citations made to Design Build Contractor during contract (if any)						Quantity
Number of OHS Section 18 serious injury or accident notifications made to Province by Design Build Contractor during contract (if any)						Quantity

Category: Disputes

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
Use of Disputes by Design Build Contractor	Unusually large number of disputes arose during contract or negotiation rarely resolved the disputes requiring unreasonable amount of use of formal dispute resolution processes.		Design Build Contractor is reasonable in filing disputes with the City on legitimate matters		Negotiation resolved all disputes. Advancement to a formal dispute resolution process was never required to resolve differences.	Rating
# of Design Build Contractor disputes that went to Referee						Quantity
# of Design Build Contractor disputes that went to or are going to Arbitration						Quantity
# of Design Build Contractor disputes that went to or are going to Court						Quantity
% of amount received by Design Build Contractor to amount claimed						Quantity
# of Design Build Contractor disputes ruled in favor of City						Quantity
# of disputes ruled in favor of Design Build Contractor						Quantity

