

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	
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
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

Category: Management

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
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
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	
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
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: 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: 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	
Contractor Working Under COE Supervision (compliance with COE safety rules and evidence of staff safety training)	The Contractor's employees repeatedly fail to comply with safety rules established by City staff (i.e. wearing PPE, shortcutting safety procedures). Contractor places self or others in imminent danger (e.g. confined space entry without testing or training, working at heights without fall protection). 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 Contractor's staff violate minor safety rules (i.e. non-imminent danger) or procedures but remedy situation quickly and does not repeat behaviour. 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.		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	
Contractor Expected to Work Independently (an effective OHS management system that ensures safety of own staff)	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). Contractor staff places self or others in imminent danger (e.g. confined space entry without testing or training, working at heights without fall protection). 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.		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 Contractor takes prompt action to remove individuals from the site. Minor safety violations occasionally occur but the Contractor takes prompt action to enforce safety rules. 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.		Contractor does comprehensive hazard assessment and develops good safe work procedures. Safety inspections done by Contractor and project manager show safety practices consistently well done. Staff are well trained in required safety procedures and do not violate safety rules.	Rating

Category: Safety

	(1) Unacceptable	(2) Between Unacceptable and Acceptable	(3) Acceptable	(4) Between Acceptable and Exceptional	(5) Exceptional	
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)	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.		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.		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
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 Contractor at start of contract						Quantity
Number of Medical Aid Claims reported to WCB by Contractor (if any during contract)						Quantity
Number of Lost Time Claims reported to WCB by 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 Contractor during contract (if any)						Quantity
Number of OHS Section 18 serious injury or accident notifications made to Province by 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 Contractor	Unusually large number of disputes arose during contract and negotiation rarely resolved the disputes requiring unreasonable amount of use of formal dispute resolution processes.		Contractor is reasonable in filing formal 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 Contractor disputes that went to Referee						Quantity
# of Contractor disputes that went to or are going to Arbitration						Quantity
# of Contractor disputes that went to or are going to Court						Quantity
% of amount received by Contractor to amount claimed						Quantity
# of Contractor disputes ruled in favor of City						Quantity
# of disputes ruled in favor of Contractor						Quantity