



2022 Hourly Work List

During the 2022 construction season, Red Deer County Operations will be undertaking some drainage and minor road maintenance work. In accordance with the Procurement Process Procedure 2.022, contractors are invited to submit their desire and availability to perform work for the County. This will involve the hourly contracting of related equipment for various projects. We will be requiring work to be done by some of the following equipment including, but not limited to:

Dozer * Backhoe * Excavator * Roller * Grader * Scraper * Skid Steer * Trucking * Other

Red Deer County pays 85% of current hourly ARHCA rates, published by the Alberta Roadbuilders & Heavy Construction Association. **By submitting your interest to be included on Red Deer County's 2022 hourly work list, you are agreeing to provide services at this reduced rate for the duration of the 2022 construction season**, as well, you also agree to the following:

- Mobilization is not included in the hourly rental rate and will be extra to the rate to a maximum of 3 hours. Demobilization charges are not typically allowed, however in rare instances they may be charged. In that instance they must be approved on a job by job basis in advance of the work.
- Service Truck is considered at \$55.00 per day per contractor being assigned.
- Labor rate is a maximum \$45.00 per hour.
- An added supervisor rate will only apply **at Red Deer County's approval**, at a maximum rate of \$60 per hour.
- Third party equipment or supplies used by the contractor will be paid at a maximum of 10% over invoice (copy of third-party invoice must be provided).

Work will be distributed in a fair and equitable manner depending on required equipment type and availability, however, Red Deer County will not guarantee that all contractors will get work due to the nature of the scope of work and/or location of work.

For the purposes of the Occupational Health & Safety Act and Alberta Regulations, the role of contractors hired through this program shall be that of prime, unless notified otherwise.

Contractors will be required to sign a service contract prior to the commencement of each project. Following each project completion, the contractor will be rated on their performance. An evaluation score of less than 70% will result in removal from the Hourly Work List for a period of 1 year, after which the contractor may reapply to be included. A sample contractor evaluation form is attached as a reference.

To be included on Red Deer County's hourly work list, please submit to us by mail, email, or in person, your Equipment List including **make, model and year of each piece of equipment**, WCB Clearance, any available Safety Certification and Proof of Insurance, along with page 2 fully completed to the following address by **March 4, 2022**:

Red Deer County
38106 Range Rd 275
Red Deer County, AB
T4S 2L9
Attn: Tammy Shott
Or by email to tshott@rdcounty.ca

For more information, please contact Tammy Shott, Contract Support Assistant, at 403.342.8658 or tshott@rdcounty.ca.



2022 Hourly Work List Contractor Information

Company Name: _____

Company Website: (if any) _____

Company or Office Address: _____

Main Company Contact: (please print) _____

Cell Number: _____ Email: _____

What type of work are you most inclined to do: Road Construction

Drainage Other _____

Best Person to Contact at Office: (if different) _____

Office Number: (if different) _____

Please make sure you've enclosed:

- WCB Confirmation
- COR/SECOR
- A copy of Your Insurance Certificate
- Your equipment list with year, make, and model
- This completed and signed document

Please email your completed document and attached information
tshott@rdcounty.ca.

By signing below, you agree to the 2022 Hourly Work List conditions:

Authorized Signature

**Red Deer County
CONTRACTOR RATING FORM**

PROJECT: _____
 CONTRACTOR: _____
 ORIGINAL DATE: _____
 REVISION DATE: _____
 RATED BY: _____

FILE #: _____
 SITE SUPERVISOR: _____
 TITLE: _____

	Rating Items	Owner Rating of Contractor	Maximum Rating	Weighting (%)	Weighted Score (%)	Comments (Attach detail as necessary)
1	Quality of Submittals		4	5		
2	Overall Workmanship		4	20		
3	Project Management		4	10		
4	Safety		3	10		
5	Traffic Accomodation & Stakeholder Communication		4	10		
6	Adherence to Schedule		4	10		
7	Professionalism		4	10		
8	Environmental Protection		4	10		
9	Reasonableness of Budget/Claims		4	15		

Total: 35 100

CONTRACTOR SCORE ACHIEVED (%)	0.0
--------------------------------------	-----

Contractor Signature

Owner Signature

Date

Date

Notes:

- 1 See attached sheet for background of Rating Items
- 2 Rating Scales are for guidance only. Reasonableness during evaluation will apply.
- 3 Contractor has five (5) business days to provide comments to Owner/Consultant on rating. If comments are not received during that time period, the evaluation will be considered accepted.
- 4 An evaluation score of less than 70% will result in removal from the Pre-Qualified Contractor List, as per the Pre-Qualification Process

**Red Deer County
RATING ITEM GUIDELINES**

		Rating Scales			
		4	3	2	1
		Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Improvement Needed	Unacceptable
1	Quality of Submittals	Submittals all received well in advance without consultant request	All submittals were generally submitted on time, Consultant had to occasionally request	Approx. half the submittals were submitted late, with frequent reminders by Consultant	Consultant repeatedly requested submittals / submittals late or outright missing
		GC reviewed within his capabilities prior to sending to Consultant to review	GC completed cursory review of submittals within his capabilities, provided some input	GC reviewed some submittals within his capabilities, but did not review others	GC did not review any submittals within his capabilities prior to sending to consultant
		High quality submittals with only minimal changes, or no resubmittals	Acceptable quality submittals but required some large changes	Generally acceptable to poor submittals with the majority requiring resubmission and some large changes	Poor quality submittals, requiring extensive changes and several resubmittals
2	Overall Workmanship	All components were constructed per design with improvements suggested by the Contractor	Generally constructed in accordance with design	Generally in accordance with design, although some minor components had to be accepted which were not as designed	Major components were not constructed per the design, and compromises were made on the final product
		No significant defects	Minor defects on various components	Major defects on various components	Aspects completed with significant defects and have failed QC testing
		All components would be considered a like new or 10/10 (or equivalent on another scale)	Major components very good/good and would be rated 7-8/10 (or equivalent on another scale)	Major components adequate and would be rated 5-6/10 (or equivalent on another scale)	Major components would be considered poor and < 5/10 (or equivalent on another scale)
3	Project Management	Foresaw and proactively solved potential problems	Solved problems with minimal Consultant guidance	Attempted to solve problems but required regular Consultant guidance	Unable to foresee or solve problems independently
		Accountable for sub-contractor performance	GC noted sub-contractor work resulted in issues, but recognized GC is ultimately accountable and rectified them	GC noted sub-contractor work resulted in issues and GC is ultimately accountable, however did not rectify them on a reasonable timeline	Blamed sub-contractors for issues and failed to recognize GC is accountable for the entire project
		Superintendent always on-site, and PM frequently on site and/or always available by phone and aware of site dealings	Superintendent regularly on-site. PM on-site when required, however aware of all site dealings. Staff worked without supervision occasionally.	PM and superintendent on-site when required, unaware of some site dealings. Site staff struggled to work without supervision occasionally	Minimal site presence by PM and superintendent. Consultant effectively required to direct staff and manage the job for the Contractor.
		Regular and effective communication through proper channels. All parties aware of discussions	Communication was good, but sometimes not all parties were aware of discussions	Communication was adequate to poor, most times parties were unaware of discussions	Poor communication and difficult to get in touch with
		Attendance at all meetings and key events	Missed a meeting or event, but generally attended or assigned qualified substitute	Often missed a meeting or event, with no assigned qualified substitute	Lack of attendance at meetings and key events
4	Safety	X	Safety evident and paramount to on-site personnel. Contractor and subs worked in a safe manner, adhering to typical construction safety policies.	Safety appeared secondary to the project, and only some staff displayed good safety practices.	Did not display signs of following any safety policy. Work performed in an unsafe manner.
			No safety concerns noted.	Safety concerns were noted and had to be brought to the attention of the GC, and were not addressed immediately.	Safety concerns were noted multiple times and had to be brought to the attention of the GC.
5	Traffic Accomodation & Stakeholder Communication	Detour traffic flowed extremely well with no concerns	Occasional concerns with traffic detour	Frequent concerns with detour traffic	Detour Traffic concerns within Contractor control persisted throughout project
		Contractor inspected detour daily and rectified concerns immediately	Contractor regularly inspected detour and rectified concerns	Contractor inspected detour on occasion, and rarely rectified concerns	Contractor did not inspect detour route unless repeatedly requested to, did not deal with concerns
		Dust was controlled and route maintained proactively	Minimal concerns about dust expressed by residents, which Contractor responded within a reasonable timeframe	High volume of concerns about dust expressed by residents, which Contractor responded within a reasonable timeframe	Dust mitigation was substandard and/or required multiple requests
		Signage was proactively updated as required	Signage was updated proactively with minimal requests by Owner	Signage was updated only after Owner requests	Signage was not updated, even after repeated requests by Owner
		Stakeholder concerns within Contractor control were respectfully dealt with. Contractor maintained positive rapport with stakeholders.	Stakeholder concerns were managed by the Contractor as required, in a respectful manner.	Stakeholder concerns were secondary and only managed by the Contractor if directed by the Owner.	If stakeholder concerns within Contractor control were raised, Contractor ignored or was disrespectful.
		Road was only closed as required	Road closed unnecessarily for max of 1-2 days	Road closed unnecessarily for max of 4 days	Road was unnecessarily closed frequently with no work going on

Red Deer County
RATING ITEM GUIDELINES

		Rating Scales			
		4	3	2	1
		Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Improvement Needed	Unacceptable
6	Adherence to Schedule	Contractor established reasonable schedule and stuck to it	Minor adjustments to schedule were required, although were typical for this type of project	Major adjustments to schedule were required	Contractor's schedule required several major adjustments and extended beyond specified completion date in tender
		Schedule was updated as required and resubmitted when changes arose	Schedule changes were generally communicated, Consultant had to request updated schedule	Schedule changes were not communicated, Consultant had to constantly request schedule	Schedule was ambiguous, never updated, and never provided to Consultant after Pre-Construction Meeting
		Schedule overage was due only to out of scope work or unforeseen circumstances	Schedule required minor extensions due to aspects beyond reasonable control.	Schedule required major extensions due to Contractor's own delays	Schedule was extended significantly beyond original schedule, entirely to aspects within Contractor control
		Phase breaks were planned in advance	Contractor required small break due to unforeseen scheduling issues	Contractor required large break due to inadequate scheduling	Breaks taken reactively due to poor scheduling
		Deficiencies were proactively corrected within 2 weeks of substantial completion	Deficiencies corrected within 4 weeks of substantial completion, Contractor required reminding	Deficiencies corrected within 6 weeks of substantial completion, Contractor required numerous reminders	Deficiency correction after substantial completion took >6 weeks, and required repeated follow-up by Consultant
7	Professionalism	Treated all parties with respect at all times, even in difficult situations	Generally treated all parties with respect at all times, even in difficult situations	Treated all parties with minimal respect throughout project	General abusive and disrespectful to various parties
		Acted with integrity, ethics, and honesty in every situation, even if the outcome may not benefit contractor	Generally acted with integrity, ethics, and honesty	Occasionally acted with integrity, ethics, and honesty	Lacked integrity, behaved with dishonesty and lack of ethics, told outright lies which could be verified
		Demonstrated extensive experience, competence and knowledge in their field	Demonstrated acceptable experience, competence and knowledge in their field	Demonstrated poor experience, competence and knowledge in their field	Significant lack of knowledge and competence in their field
		Demonstrated a positive partnering attitude throughout project	Generally showed interest in partnering	Occasionally showed interest in partnering	Ignored / disinterested in partnering or developing positive relationships
8	Environmental Protection	Displayed a genuine respect for the environment, understanding the rationale behind required protection	Respected all environmental clauses and regulations	Only respected environmental clauses and regulations after reminders by the Owner	Displayed disrespect for the environment
		Proactively carried out and understood all environmental requirements and promptly supplied results	Completed environmental monitoring and testing as per the spec, results were supplied upon request and were generally clear	Completed environmental monitoring and testing only after reminders by the Consultant, results were supplied upon request and were generally poor	Failed to carry out environmental requirements and was unable to provide meaningful results
		Used qualified and experienced environmental consultants	Most testing and monitoring was completed by competent and knowledgeable staff	Minimal testing and monitoring was completed by competent and knowledgeable staff	Did not have qualified staff undertaking environmental testing and monitoring
		Care of water was appropriate, safe, with minimal environmental impact	Care of water was adequate, with minimal environmental impact	Care of water was poor, with environmental impact that could have been avoided	Care of water was inadequate, unsafe, and/or resulted in a negative impact to water quality
9	Reasonableness of Budget / Claims	Understood intent of contract was for a complete job and did not seek unreasonable claims	Claims were minimal with proper support information, and generally all parties agreed	Claims were frequent, without proper support information and often unreasonable	Appeared to comb contract language for holes in order to submit claims
		Claim requests were for clear unknowns or out of scope tasks	Most claims were for clear unknowns or out of scope tasks	Most aspects of claims were for tasks considered part of scope	Claims were submitted for ambiguous items and difficult to quantify
		Written claim notices were provided within 3 business days	Major claims submitted within 7 days, minor claims communicated verbally within time frame stipulated in contract	Claim requests appeared reactive and were submitted late or beyond timeframe stipulated in contract	Claim requests only appeared at the end of the project, well beyond timeframe stipulated in contract