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Council Public Works Meeting
MINUTES
Tuesday, January 28, 2020
Council Chambers
County Administration Building

Present
Reeve Terry Van de Kraats
Councillor Josh Bishop
Councillor Bill Krahn
Councillor Dale Woitt
Councillor Ken Adair
Councillor Kathy Rooyakkers
Councillor Lyle Seely

Staff Present
Rod Hawken, Chief Administrative Officer
Delores DeBlois, Recording Secretary
Neil Powell, Director of Public Works

1. CALL TO ORDER
The Council for Public Works meeting for the County of Wetaskiwin No. 10 was called to order by Reeve T. Van de Kraats in the Council Chambers, of the County of Wetaskiwin Administration Office, commencing at 9:01 a.m. on Tuesday, January 28, 2020.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Resolution PW20200128.001
MOVED: by Councillor K. Adair
that the agenda be accepted as presented.
Carried Unanimously

3. CONSENT AGENDA
Resolution PW20200128.002
MOVED: by Councillor D. Woitt
that Council approve the items listed on the Consent Agenda as follows:

3.1. Council for Public Works Minutes, December 10, 2019
3.2. December 2019 Director Report
3.3. December 2019 Shop Foreman Report
3.4. December 2019 Utilities Foreman Report
3.5. December 2019 Division 1-5 (East End Foreman) Report
3.6. December 2019 Division 6-7 (West End Foreman) Report
3.7. December 2019 Right of Entry Agreement Report
3.8. December 2019 Solid Waste Haul Data Report
3.9. December 2019 Road Use Agreement / Roadata Report
3.10. December 2019 GP Road Inspections Report
3.11. December 2019 Service Request Management Report
Carried Unanimously

4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
4.1 Residential Collection of Solid Waste Material in Mulhurst Bay and Curilane Beach - Report
Resolution PW20200128.003
MOVED: by Reeve T. Van de Kraats

that Council approve to purchase a new garbage truck at an approximate cost of $250,000.00.

Recorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favour:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reeve T. Van de Kraats</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor J. Bishop</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor B. Krahn</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor D. Woitt</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor K. Adair</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor K. Rooyakkers</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor L. Seely</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results
2
5

Defeated (2 to 5)

Resolution PW20200128.004
MOVED: by Councillor L. Seely

that Council award service contracts to NuLine Waste Solutions for Residential Collection of Solid Waste Material in Service Areas 6 and 7 (Mulhurst/Lakeland Estates and Curilane Beach), effective March 1, 2020 to December 31, 2022.

Recorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favour:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reeve T. Van de Kraats</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor J. Bishop</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor B. Krahn</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor D. Woitt</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor K. Adair</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor K. Rooyakkers</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor L. Seely</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results
5
2

Carried (5 to 2)

Resolution PW20200128.005
MOVED: by Councillor B. Krahn

that the County retain one of the used garbage collection units as a back-up unit in case of emergency.

Recorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favour:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reeve T. Van de Kraats</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor J. Bishop</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor B. Krahn</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor D. Woitt</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor K. Adair</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor K. Rooyakkers</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor L. Seely</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results
6
1

Carried (6 to 1)

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Proposed Brushing Program, 2020 Work Plan - Report
Resolution PW20200128.006
MOVED: by Councillor L. Seely

that Council accept the Brushing Program, 2020 Work Plan as information.

Carried Unanimously

5.2 Fees & Charges Bylaw 2020/08 to Repeal 2019/35 - Report

Bylaw 2020/08 - Fees and Charges, is a bylaw in the County of Wetaskiwin in the Province of Alberta to establish fees for various services and to make certain information available to the public and to repeal Bylaw 2019/35 with the following amendment:

- Solid Waste Collection fee increase from $12.50 per month to $20.50 per month, effective January 1, 2020.

Resolution PW20200128.007
MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop

that By-law 2020/08 be given First Reading.

Recorded

In Favour: Opposed:
Reeve T. Van de Kraats X
Councillor J. Bishop X
Councillor B. Krahn X
Councillor D. Woitt X
Councillor K. Adair X
Councillor K. Rooyakkers X
Councillor L. Seely X

Results: 5 2
Carried (5 to 2)

Resolution PW20200128.008
MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop

that By-law 2020/08 be given Second Reading.

Recorded

In Favour: Opposed:
Reeve T. Van de Kraats X
Councillor J. Bishop X
Councillor B. Krahn X
Councillor D. Woitt X
Councillor K. Adair X
Councillor K. Rooyakkers X
Councillor L. Seely X

Results: 4 3
Carried (4 to 3)

Resolution PW20200128.009
MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop

that By-law 2020/08 be presented for Third Reading.

Carried Unanimously

Resolution PW20200128.010
MOVED: by Councillor L. Seely

that By-law 2020/08 be given Third Reading and it be declared finally passed and the Reeve and Chief Administrative Officer be authorized to sign and affix thereto the corporate seal of the County of Wetaskiwin No. 10.
5.3 **Proposed 2020 Council Road Tour - Report**

**Resolution PW20200128.011**

MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop

that Council approve the 2020 Council Road Tour to be held on June 8 (West End) and June 12 (East End), 2020 to visit the following sites, with the meals to be arranged by Administration:

**East:**
- G3 Grain Facility
- BF8191- WNW 15-45-26 W4M - Contracted to Formula Alberta Ltd.
- Hamlet revitalization: Hamlet of Gwynne; Hamlet of Mulhurst; Hamlet of Falun
- Mulhurst Lagoon
- Sod Farm Hill; RGE RD 233 North of TWP RD 470 - 2020 Road Construction
- 2020 Brushing Projects: as completed in early 2020
- Water Re-rehabilitation - Ermineskin Drainage Collaboration
- Edmonton International Race Track
- Fifth Gen Gardens - 231048 A Secondary Highway 611 - Kristin Graves
- Pine Haven Colony Tour

**West:**
- BF71375 – WSW 17-45-7 W5M - Contracted to Volker Stevin Highways Ltd.
- Alder Flats Wastewater Collection System
- Hamlet revitalization: Hamlet of Westerose Hamlet of Winfield; Hamlet of Buck Lake; Hamlet of Alder Flats; Hamlet of Village of Pigeon Lake
- Twin Lakes Parks
- South Pigeon Lake Business Park at the intersection of HWY 771 and HWY 13
- TWP RD 464 from HWY 22 west to RGE RD 73 – 2020 Road Construction
- Dorchester Ranch Development – Road Infrastructure
- Range Road 11 and 12
- Blackmore Shooting Range
- Parks - Open space land (ie: County Quarter)
- Tour of Gone Green Farms.

Carried Unanimously

7. **ADJOURN**

**Resolution PW20200128.012**

MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop

that the Council for Public Works meeting be adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

Carried Unanimously
GENERAL:

Typical snow and some very cold days in the month of January. Nothing unusual with any significant storms or incidents to report. Crews were dispatched as necessary to deal with snow accumulations and icy conditions.

The following purchases were made through Executive Limitations Policy 1905:

- RFQ: Shop Press provided by NAPA Auto Parts for $9,995.00
- RFQ: Shop Welder provided by Weld World for $5,335.85
- Used Remote Trench Packer: provided by A-1 Supply Camrose: 2015 Whacker Trench Tracker for $24,500
- Replace front plow for T4815: provided by Commercial Truck Equipment for $7,647.38

PUBLIC WORKS:

Work has initiated on Bridge File 8191. Some of the initial effort included reallocation of overhead power utilities, set up of local road detour and removal of the existing bridge. This project has a completion date of July 31, 2020.
Work on Bridge File 71375 has been re-initiated by the contractor, Volker Stevin. It will take a few more weeks to complete the work.

Design and tender preparation is proceeding with the 2020 bridge replacement projects BF 6773 and BF 75450. These will be tendered within the next few weeks.

The 2020 Brushing program is underway. There were a few very cold days (-30 to -40 C) where the work was suspended, however the program is proceeding well with approximately $100,000 of the $200,000 budget expensed. Once work is complete, a full report card and cost analysis will be prepared for each site and presented to Council.
Preparing and organizing documents, environmental approvals and Pit Plans for the Hilgartner Pit. The objective is to begin stripping of topsoil and overburden once the Pit Plan has been accepted by Alberta Environment and Parks. The plan is to commence crushing operations in 2020.

The G3 Resource Road project is in winter shutdown for the period of November to April. The County will perform winter maintenance on this road section during this period. The balance of this 2019 project is carried over to 2020. Administration is finalizing the land purchase details with legal survey and registered plans.

The Em-Te-Town Road project is in winter shutdown for the period of November to April. The County will perform winter maintenance on this road section during this period. The balance of this 2019 project is carried over to 2020.

**UTILITIES:**

Phase 2 of the South Pigeon Lake Regional Wastewater System is primarily complete. Lift Station No. 3 and its forcemain to the Village at Pigeon Lake is now in service. There remains a few small items to rectify before the final holdback is released to the two contractors involved in the project.

The County, WSP and UG Excavating held a pre-construction meeting in late January regarding the Alder Flats Sewer Collection System Expansion. The contractor has indicated that work will begin with lift station construction in early March 2020. A letter from the County has been issued to all affected landowners notifying them of the upcoming work and a tentative work schedule.

The Winfield water treatment plant is still without a fire pump. Utilities is working with WSP and a supplier to get a new permanent pump in place. In the case of a fire, the hydrants will still supply water, albeit at a much lower flow. **UPDATE:** a majority of the components have been ordered and work is scheduled for completion some time in mid March.

As per Council direction, a garbage collection services contract has been awarded to NuLine Waste Solutions Inc to collect solid waste from the Curilane Beach and Mulhurst communities. NuLine is scheduled to take over March 1, 2020. As part of the process to disassociate County involvement and resources from these service areas, one of the two County garbage collection trucks was sold at auction. NuLine was able to purchase garbage truck T6602 for a price of $6,000. NuLine has also come to an agreement with the County employee who was performing the work previously. Essentially, very little will appear different outside of the monthly collection fee charged to the customers.
Warranty repairs were completed on the following units:

- MG0315 – 2015 Caterpillar 160M Grader – Replace steel hydraulic line

As per the Commercial Vehicle Inspection Program (CVIP), the following units were inspected for County Service:

- T3811 – 2011 Kenworth T800
- TR2316 – 2016 Centerline Quad Axle Wagon
- T8319 – 2019 Kenworth T880.

The following vehicle was prepared to go to auction:

- T6602 – 2002 Freightliner FL80
UTILITIES FOREMAN REPORT – JANUARY 2020

Report provided by Peter Pullishy, Acting Utilities Foreman

- Four Water treatment plants chlorine residual (Provincial Reporting requirement) Data logger issue workarounds. The County shop switched software 2019, and the water station data logger’s incompatibility issue is ongoing.

- Falun High School and elementary school sewer Lift stations (1990 era install). A cold snap caused each station to have one of two sewer pump discharge lines freeze, (each station was down to one pump). Communication to school maintenance supervisor; they were to run hot water daily. Troubleshooting air exchange each lift, ordered new upgraded fan control system with the interim solution being to run hot water in cold weather.

- South Side 1 sewer lift station, Utility Staff, WSP, and Total Power; troubleshoot standby diesel engine, engine doesn’t run a pump, engine shuts down on low oil pressure. Total Power /WSP, Utilities Operators, continued to troubleshoot on January 24.

- Alder Flats and Mulhurst lagoon are now to be reported Federally, with more than 100 m3 inflow per day triggers Federal Wastewater Systems Effluent Regulations (WSER) reporting requirement. Prairie lagoons cannot consistently meet fed WSER, lagoons are designed to reduce Biochemical Oxygen Demand and reduce Suspended solids in effluent, unable to reliably reduce ammonia. The Federal Government ‘forgot about lagoons’ when writing Waste System Effluent Law, [https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/sor-2012-139/fulltext.html](https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/sor-2012-139/fulltext.html)

- Alder Flats and Mulhurst Lagoon had low enough ammonia this year, but there is low confidence that they both can consistently and adequately
reduce ammonia in effluent. Correspondence with Environment Canada, enforcement Officer Deanna Cymbaluk, Environment Canada writes: (January 29) “…I strongly encourage the County of Wetaskiwin to explore options to reduce either the pH and/or the total ammonia in both these systems and any other systems they operate where the un-ionized ammonia is near or above the 0.18 mg/L mark. “

- Interim control measures could include increased monitoring of treated cell pH, ammonia, and selecting ‘best’ discharge time, may involve communication with Provincial regulator to alter allowable discharge durations. Lagoon effluent discharge pathway east of Mulhurst lagoon requires review. (Wet year, water in nature reserve).

- Residential water meter warranty returns delays, (Neptune) ongoing.

- Lead in drinking Water, new sampling requirements, meeting/training County Utilities staff with Provincial Water officials scheduled Feb 14 County Shop-Provence has altered their sampling and reporting requirements to more closely align with existing more stringent Federal law.

- Gwynne Water station standby engine load test and annual maintenance completed.

- Winfield High flow pump (600 usgpm, 145 ft head) install, delayed, pump supplier (nonstandard plumbing) held up in Calgary machine shop.

- Alder flats septic truck dump lagoon froze Friday pm, Administration organized weekend alternate temporary dump codes to other sites for west septic truckers and emailed information to them all. T. Williams thawed the system on Monday; it was too cold to move the boiler. Froze last year also. Alternate temporary Winter sewer truck dump in use with above-ground pipe parts ordered (3 sticks of 8-inch sewer pipe, cap).

- Transfer Stations have spare electric heaters-Mulhurst Transfer Station Propane heater failed Jan 14, -40 C
• Delay in installing vehicle protection wall at Peace Hills Transfer Station Oil recycle tank (which was a requirement of the Tank inspector)-Metal tank is frozen to ground.

• Utility Staff Safety Training under review - Hazard Assessment Training to be completed soon.
Winter road maintenance continued to be performed due to snow, freeze/thaw cycles creating icy road conditions.

Arranged Right-of-Entry agreements as applicable for various landowners for continuation of the 2020 East-End Brushing Program.

Commenced & completed portions of the 2020 East-End Brushing Program.

  - TWP 442 (RGE RD 231 – RGE RD 234) Completed (ash/stumps to be removed in spring of 2020)
  - TWP 450 (East of RGE RD 225) Completed (ash/stumps to be removed in spring of 2020)
  - RGE RD 235 (North of TWP 450) Underway
  - TWP 465 (SH 795 – RGE RD 273) Underway

Applied & compacted cold-mix patching material to multiple potholes on the “Golf Course Road”;
TWP 464 (HWY 2A to RGE RD 245).

Sent letters to contract haulers for the 2020 Fall Gravel Program.

Purchased remote Trench Packer for use to achieve proper material compaction during culvert installations and small-sized road construction jobs.

Ongoing signage installation, garbage pick-up, hand-brushing, tree removal, etc.
Division 6-7 (West End Foreman)

- Snowplowed and sanded the paved and oiled roads.
- Snowplowed and winged back all gravel roads.
- Scarified the icy intersections and hills.
- Cleared and burned the trees on both sides of RGE RD 72 between TWP 454 and HWY 13.
- Cleared and burned the trees on both sides of RGE RD 74 South of TWP 450A.
- Cleared and burned trees on TWP 450 between RGE RD 74 and RGE RD 73.
- Mulched all the stumps and small brush where the trees have been cleared.
- Cleared ice off the main street in Winfield from a flowing well.
- Started stockpiling gravel at the Winfield transfer station.
- Thawed a culvert on RGR RD 42 south of TWP 460 that was building up ice on the road.
- Built an attachment for the skid steer to scarify ice in the alleys and other places where the grader can't get to.
- Repaired and maintained equipment and vehicles.
The following Right of Entry Agreements were signed in the month of January to allow the County crews to brush fence line and pile wood and debris:

- Kinsey, Tyson and Sarah – NE 11-44-23 W4M;
- Grecko, Matthew – SE 34-46-27 W4M;
- Zielke, Brady – NW 26-46-27 W4M;
- Zielke, Michael – NW 26-26-27 W4M.
## SOLID WASTE HAUL DATA REPORT – JANUARY 2020

### WEST DRIEDMEAT LAKE
Data Compilation - Transfer Stations
January 1 - December 31, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bearhills</th>
<th>Hilgartner</th>
<th>Lakedell</th>
<th>Millet</th>
<th>Peace Hills</th>
<th>Recycling-Ag Plastics</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Users</td>
<td>Loads</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td># Users</td>
<td>Loads</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Loads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,450</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,980</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,450</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,980</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,450</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,980</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winfield</th>
<th>Buck Lake</th>
<th>Gwynne</th>
<th>Mulhurst</th>
<th>Crossroads Waste</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
<th>Mattresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Users</td>
<td>Loads</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td># Users</td>
<td>Loads</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td># Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22,429</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44,506</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22,429</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44,506</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22,429</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44,506</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** 12 loads of ash taken from the burn pit in Lakedell (64,850 kg).
ROAD USE AGREEMENTS – JANUARY 2020

The following Road Use Agreements were processed by PW Administration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initiated</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contaminated Haul</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauler</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Haul</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Agreement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tele Comm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellsite</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ROADATA – JANUARY 2020

There were 195 permits issued by Roadata regarding the use of County of Wetaskiwin roads.

There were 75 Travis MJ permits issued for a total amount of $1,087.50 plus GST.

There were 9 RDS Inspection Service Charges for a total of $189.00 plus GST.
GP ROAD INSPECTIONS – JANUARY 2020

The following totals were submitted by GP Road Inspections for the month of January 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Inspections</th>
<th>Post-Inspections</th>
<th>Approach Inspections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two-year Contract with Christine Patten, operating as GP Road Inspections - 820513406 Alberta Ltd., effective March 1, 2019 to February 28, 2021. (Ref. Resolution PW20190129.007)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request ID</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Date Reported</th>
<th>Requested By</th>
<th>Assigned To</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Business Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>01/09/18 10:15AM</td>
<td>Councillor L. Seely</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>05/06/19 2:15PM</td>
<td>Councillor Bill Krahn</td>
<td>Laverne Buchert</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>07/25/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Rooyakkers</td>
<td>Dallas Vikse</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>10/10/19 9:30AM</td>
<td>Councillor Seely</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>10/08/19 4:15PM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>10/23/2018 11:39 AM</td>
<td>Councillor Woitt</td>
<td>Clarence Claerhout</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>11/06/19 2:00PM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>11/12/19 8:45AM</td>
<td>Councillor Woitt</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>11/27/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Woitt</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>11/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Woitt</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>11/17/19 11:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>12/06/19 9:00AM</td>
<td>Councillor Adair</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3200 Public Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT COSTING REPORT – JANUARY 2020

To the end of JANUARY 2020 represents 8.33% of the budget year. The overall PW and UT budget expenditures reported below total $1,176,135 or 3.2% of the $36,345,141 (2020 budget).

Public Works Budget

3201 Administration Budget: $2,663,546 with $161,281 expended to date (6.1% of the budget). Tracking as expected with Fleet Capital expenditures starting to accrue and new equipment tenders prepared and posted.

3202 Fleet Management Budget: $4,454,000 with $201,416 expended to date (4.5% of the budget). Tracking as expected.

3203 Funded Projects Budget: $8,985,047 with $198,392 expended to date (2.2% of the budget). Most projects are awaiting tender approval or are in winter shut down (i.e. 2019 projects). Bridge projects will commence when weather is favourable.

3204 Patrol Operators Budget: $2,574,000 with $192,157 expended to date (7.5% of the budget). Tracking as expected.

3205 Road Maintenance Budget: $2,668,399 with $199,122 expended to date. (7.5% of the budget). Early in the year. Tracking as expected with winter road maintenance (sanding and snowplowing) being the main activities.

3206 Road Construction Budget: $3,496,500 with $14,273 expended to date. (0.4% of the budget). Some 2019 winter projects were deferred and are still in winter shutdown. 2020 projects are in the process of tender preparation and advertising. Expect tender results presented at the March 2020 PW Council meeting.

3207 Paved Roads Budget: $1,332,200 with $3,049 expended to date. (0.2% of the budget). Golf Course Road – pavement upgrade tender recommendation will be presented at the February Council for PW meeting.

3208 Graveling Budget: $2,708,105 with $21,159 expended to date. Work will begin in early June with the summer gravelling program. The main gravelling program is scheduled for the beginning of September.

Public Works Summary: Total Budget of $28,881,797 with $990,849 expended to date, or 3.4% of the budget.
Utilities Budget: 4100 Water Services Budget: $1,899,157 with $25,856 expended to date (1.4% of the budget).

4200 Wastewater Services Budget: $4,262,105 with $65,169 expended to date (1.5% of the budget). Alder Flats Sewer Expansion capital project scheduled to begin March 2020.

4300 Solid Waste Management Budget: $1,302,082 with $94,261 expended to date (7.2% of the budget). Tracking as expected.

Utilities Summary: Total Budget of $7,463,344 with $185,286 expended to date, or 2.5% of the budget.

County of Wetaskiwin
1-PW Expense Report for Council
To the End of January 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2020</th>
<th>Actual 2020</th>
<th>YTD Variance</th>
<th>%YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3201-00 PW Adminstration</td>
<td>2,663,546</td>
<td>161,281</td>
<td>2,502,265</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3202-00 PW Fleet Management</td>
<td>4,454,000</td>
<td>201,416</td>
<td>4,252,584</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3203-00 PW Funded Projects</td>
<td>8,985,047</td>
<td>198,392</td>
<td>8,786,655</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3204-00 PW Patrols</td>
<td>2,574,000</td>
<td>192,157</td>
<td>2,381,843</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3205-00 PW Maintenance</td>
<td>2,668,399</td>
<td>199,122</td>
<td>2,469,277</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3206-00 PW Road Construction</td>
<td>3,496,500</td>
<td>14,273</td>
<td>3,482,227</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3207-00 PW Oiling</td>
<td>1,332,200</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>1,329,151</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3208-00 PW Gravelling</td>
<td>2,708,105</td>
<td>21,159</td>
<td>2,686,945</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>28,881,797</td>
<td>990,849</td>
<td>27,890,948</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2020</th>
<th>Actual 2020</th>
<th>YTD Variance</th>
<th>%YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4100-00 Water Services</td>
<td>1,899,157</td>
<td>25,856</td>
<td>1,873,301</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4200-00 Wastewater Services</td>
<td>4,262,105</td>
<td>65,169</td>
<td>4,196,936</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4300-00 Solid Waste Management</td>
<td>1,302,082</td>
<td>94,261</td>
<td>1,207,821</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>7,463,344</td>
<td>185,286</td>
<td>7,278,058</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background
The Wetaskiwin Agricultural Society will be hosting their Annual Rawhide Rodeo on June 12, 13 & 14, 2020 at the Wetaskiwin Agricultural grounds. The Committee is requesting permission to use the County of Wetaskiwin water truck to water the arena to eliminate dust. The Committee approached Greg Ambler (a County of Wetaskiwin employee) to operate the water truck.

In previous years, Council has approved the use of the water truck, subject to availability and with the condition that County Staff certified in the use of the vehicle, be the only operator of the water truck.

The Committee is also requesting delivery and use of one County of Wetaskiwin roll off bin throughout the weekend of the rodeo.

In previous years Council has approved the use of the roll-off bin in the past subject to availability in accordance with Permitted Use of Roll-off Bins Policy 40.3.3. Costs to the County include delivery of the bin to and from the site, as well as tipping fee for disposal of the solid waste.

Recommended Resolution
that, subject to availability, Council approve the request from the Wetaskiwin Agricultural Society, Rawhide Rodeo Committee as follows:

1. Use of a County water truck for the purpose of watering the arena during the Rawhide Rodeo on June 12, 13 & 14, 2020 with Greg Ambler (County of Wetaskiwin employee) being the sole operator of the truck; and
2. Delivery and use of a roll off bin throughout the weekend of the rodeo.
February 11, 2020

County of Wetaskiwin No. 10
Box 6960
Wetaskiwin, AB
T9A 2G5

Attention Council:

Please consider our request for use of the County of Wetaskiwin water truck, delivery of a roll off bin and two dumpsters for the Wetaskiwin Rawhide Rodeo — June 12, 13 and 14, 2020 at the Wetaskiwin Agricultural Society’s grounds. The water truck would be used to water the arena eliminating the dust if needed and the roll off bin would alleviate the issue of garbage removal for an event of this size.

We have approached County employee Greg Ambler to donate his time for the operation of the truck. All safety precautions will be taken to ensure the truck is handled in a responsible manner. We understand if there is an emergency, the county obligations receive priority.

We appreciate your past contributions to this community event. Please contact the Wetaskiwin Agricultural Society at 352-2780, email – wetagsoc@xplornet.com or fax 780-352-3790.

We thank you in advance for your consideration.

Wetaskiwin Agricultural Society
Rawhide Rodeo Committee 2020
Background
On January 17, 2020, the County of Wetaskiwin received confirmation of funding assistance under the Disaster Recovery Program from Alberta Municipal Affairs, signed by Minister Kaycee Madu.

The funding will assist with repairs and restoration required following the flooding that took place on July 20 and 21, 2019 in the west end of the County. The County will be contacted by the Team Lead of the Alberta Emergency Management Agency Disaster Recovery Program to begin the recovery process.

The County essentially prepared two applications, Part 1 and Part 2, and each were required to be submitted within 90 days of the storm event. The County’s application included five projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1: Gravel Road Reclamation (Divisions 6 and 7)</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2: Range Road 31 Centreline Culvert Washout</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3: Range Road 75A – Culvert Washout and Jimbob</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4: Township Road 461 – Centreline Culvert Washout</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5: Rose Creek Road – Flood Damage Repair</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Totals: $980,000

DISCUSSION:
The initial estimates are a budget guideline for moving forward. Some accrued costs may not be eligible as they were undertaken by County personnel (e.g. Project 1). Conversely, actual eligible project costs may exceed the initial estimate and still retain full funding. PW and Finance will work closely with Alberta Emergency Management Agency (AEMA) officials and the goal is to achieve as much assistance possible under the Disaster Recovery Program. All work is expected to be completed in 2020.

Recommended Resolution
that Council accept the update from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Honorable Kaycee Madu, informing of the funding approval granted through the Disaster Recovery Program for repair and restoration of the 2019 West Flood.
JAN 15 2020

Reeve Terry Van de Kraats
County of Wetaskiwin No. 10
PO Box 6960
Wetaskiwin AB T9A 2G5

Dear Reeve Van de Kraats,

I am pleased to inform you the County of Wetaskiwin No. 10 has been approved for financial assistance under the Disaster Recovery Program to facilitate repairs and restoration of damaged infrastructure due to the flooding event on July 20 and 21, 2019.

An Alberta Emergency Management Agency Disaster Recovery Program team lead will contact representatives from your community to assist with the delivery of the program.

Rest assured, your community's recovery is of great importance. I will ensure your community is supported as it recovers from this event. Strengthening local communities, improving the lives of Albertans, and contributing to the economic revitalization of the province through programs, such as the Disaster Recovery Program, are priorities for me.

Should you require further information regarding your approval for financial assistance, please contact Jennifer Dolecki, Director of Community Recovery Services, toll-free at 310-0000, then 780-289-3368, or via email at jennifer.dolecki@gov.ab.ca.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

Kaycee Madu
Minister

cc: Jennifer Dolecki, Director of Community Recovery Services, Municipal Affairs
PART 2

INSTRUCTIONS

Documents and Attachments Included in the Application

Confirmation of damage, project work, completion, and estimates are required throughout the application process. Documentation may include, but are not limited to, pre- and post-event dated pictures of damages, GIS locations, quotes, estimates, invoices, reports produced by consultants, maintenance schedules and insurance information.

Appealing a Decision

A municipal or Métis Settlement applicant who receives the Managing Director’s notice of decision and wishes to appeal must submit a request for appeal within 30 days after receiving the notice; this is not applicable for ministry applicants. For more information, please contact your AEMA recovery representative.

PUBLIC SECTOR

Emergency Operations Costs Estimate
If applicable, provide a general description of the activities involved for which incremental expenses have been incurred (e.g. emergency operations centre, evacuation centre, cleanup costs, mutual aid agreement costs, and public works equipment).

Infrastructure Damage Estimate
If applicable, provide a general description of repairs to health and sanitation facilities, repairs of streets, roads, bridges, wharves, docks and water management works, etc. If available, provide a sample of location(s) of infrastructure that experienced significant damage. Locations should be identified using latitude and longitude, National Topographic System coordinates (indicate the datum used) or an address, include pictures documenting pre- and post-event damage.

Proposed Mitigation Estimate
Identify if mitigation measures will be included in the projects or if an additional project may be proposed to mitigate for future disaster events.

Additional Information
Provide any additional extraordinary facts, information, and qualitative data as to how this event has affected the community beyond infrastructure damage (e.g. interruption to special events, evacuation placements, impact to any vulnerable sectors for the longer term, economic viability concerns of the applicant.

PRIVATE SECTOR

Residential (Homeowner and Tenant) Loss Estimate
If applicable, estimate the number of homes and general description of residences affected by the event. If available, provide a list of homeowners and tenants including names, description of loss and damage, estimated loss and damage, and pictures. Only principal residences are eligible for assistance and only for uninsurable damage.

Small Business Loss Estimate
If applicable, provide a general description of the numbers and scope of businesses affected by the event. A small business is an enterprise with yearly gross revenues, as reported for income tax purposes, between $6,000 and $15,000,000, and employs no more than the equivalent of 20 full-time employees. It must also be other than a “hobby business,” and be an owner-operated enterprise, where the individual owner(s)-operator(s) is/are acting as a day-to-day manager(s), own(s) at least 50 per cent of the business and receive a minimum of 20 per cent of their gross personal income(s) from the business.

Agricultural Business Loss Estimate
Estimate the number of farms and provide a general description of farming operations impacted by the event.
### Applicant

Legal Name of Ministry, Municipality, or Métis Settlement  
County of Wetaskiwin No. 10

### Other Funding Sources Available

| Insurance information | See attached Certificate of Insurance. A full report of the policy can be sent, if required. We have contacted our insurers to see if we are covered for this type of disaster. We are still awaiting a response. The County typically is not insured for natural disasters and "Acts of God". |
| Other funding received (e.g. donations, other grants) | We have received no other funding for this disaster. |

### PUBLIC SECTOR

#### Emergency Operations Costs Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost Description</th>
<th>Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-emptive emergency operations costs (e.g. sandbagging)</td>
<td>There were no pre-emptive operations</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct emergency operations costs (e.g. incremental staffing, emergency equipment)</td>
<td>See description of the five projects. The estimated costs are a total of the five projects.</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Aid Agreement(s)</td>
<td>There was no mutual aid provided or received</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuation Costs (e.g. fuel, hotels)</td>
<td>This was not necessary</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other
(e.g. any other emergency operations costs incurred by the applicant not outlined in the above sections)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Damage Description</th>
<th>Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Routes (e.g. roads, highways)</td>
<td>Projects 1 through 5 detailed in the attached.</td>
<td>$980,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>See Project 5 - Rose Creek Road Damage to Wolf Creek and east abutment of bridge</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Systems</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Health Facilities (e.g., hospitals, medical centres)</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings (e.g., government offices, cultural institutions, educational facilities)</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g. any other major infrastructure damage incurred by the applicant not captured in the above sections)</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Mitigation Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify potential mitigation project(s) and their estimated cost.</td>
<td>Mitigative measures to prevent re-occurrence are built into the overall damage estimate. Includes increasing capacity of centreline culverts, extending length of centreline culverts and additional erosion control devices.</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRIVATE SECTOR

Residential (Homeowner and Tenant) Loss Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Impacted Homeowners</th>
<th>Number of Impacted Tenants</th>
<th>General Description of Loss and Damage</th>
<th>Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documents included that summarize losses, damages and costs.

Small Business Loss Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Impacted Small Businesses</th>
<th>Business Type (e.g., commercial, not for profit, condominium)</th>
<th>General Description of Loss and Damage</th>
<th>Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documents included that summarize losses, damages and costs.

Agricultural Business Loss Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damage Description</th>
<th>Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documents included that summarize losses, damages and costs.

Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damage Description</th>
<th>Estimated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documents included that summarize individual homeowner and tenant losses, damages and costs.

Authorized Signatures

Municipal or Métis Settlement applications without the signatures of an authorized official (e.g., Chief Elected Official, Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Financial Officer, etc.) and AEMA Field Officer will be returned. Not applicable for ministry applications.

Please ensure the authorized official is duly authorized to submit this application on behalf of the applicant. Failure to do so will result in it being considered null and void.

Signature - Authorized Official
____________________________
Neil Powell
Print Name
____________________________
Date Signed
October 21, 2019

Signature - AEMA Recovery Representative
____________________________
Print Name
____________________________
Date Signed

Signature - AEMA Field Officer
____________________________
Print Name
____________________________
Date Signed
(Not applicable for GoA Ministries)
CERTIFICATE HOLDER: CO. OF WETASKIWIN NO. 10

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 1, 2018 - EXPIRY DATE: November 1, 2019
12:01 A.M. Standard Time at the address of the Certificate Holder

The following is a summary of Coverages that are applicable to the above Certificate Holder under the RMA Insurance Program which are in force for the period shown above. Please refer to the actual policy documents for full details of all terms, conditions, limitations and exclusions applicable to the coverage afforded.

PART A: LIABILITY INSURANCE

Total Municipal Premium: $81,103.00  Total Premium: $101,232.00

Insuring Agreement

In the event that Legal Liability claims for negligence are brought against the Certificate Holder and/or the Additional Named Insured(s) hereunder, Insurers will pay compensatory damages, including legal expenses incurred, subject to the terms, conditions, limitations and exclusions of the respective Sections of the Policy.

Items of Coverage

SECTION ONE – COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL LIABILITY

Genesis Reciprocal Insurance Exchange – Until Aggregate is Exhausted

Amkin – Excess to Genesis Reciprocal Insurance Exchange
Third Party Bodily Injury and/or Property Damage
Premises and Operations
Contingent Employers Liability
Non-Owned Automobile Liability
Tenants Legal Liability
Sudden and Accidental Pollution (subject to specific discovery/reporting provisions)
Legal Liability for Damage to Non-Owned Automobiles
Employee Benefits Liability
Personal & Advertising Injury Liability

SECTION TWO – ADMINISTRATIVE LIABILITY

Wrongful Acts (Directors & Officers)

SECTION THREE – WRONGFUL DISMISSAL LIABILITY

Warranty: Must obtain prior written legal opinion from employment law practitioner

SECTION FOUR – SEXUAL ABUSE/HARASSMENT LIABILITY

NOTE: The Combined Limits of Liability stated above shall apply separately to each Certificate Holder. Further, Aggregated Limit Clauses within the Policies described herein may serve to reduce the Limit of Liability that may otherwise be available to a specific Occurrence or Claim.
Deductibles
Each and Every Property Damage Claim
(except that Sewer Backup, Flooding and other Water Damage Claims are
Each and Every Bodily Injury Claim
Administrative Liability (E&O, D&O)
Wrongful Dismissal
Sexual Harassment
School Operations

Amount to be Deducted
$1,000
$1,000 per claimant
Nil
$1,000 (or $ 2,500/10% of legal costs if charges laid under
specific statutes/regulations are unproven)
$25,000 (min.)
Nil
$500.00

In consideration of the premium specified above (or in endorsement(s) attached hereto), this document certifies that insurance has been effected under Policy No. GENESIS2012/19 of the Genesis Reciprocal Insurance Exchange and Policy No. GAI2012/19 with Underwriters at Lloyds of London (Amlin), full copies may be seen at the offices of the RMA Insurance of Nisku, Alberta and/or Aon Reed Stenhouse Inc. of Edmonton, AB for the account of the above Certificate Holder.

PART B: CYBER LIABILITY INSURANCE

Total Premium: $0

Insuring Agreement
In the event that Legal Liability claims for negligence are brought against the Certificate Holder and/or the Additional Named Insured(s) hereunder, Insurers will pay compensatory damages, including legal expenses incurred, subject to the terms, conditions, limitations and exclusions of the respective Sections of the Policy.

Items of Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined Limits of Liability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55900031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beazley Canada Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bbrcanada@beazley.com">bbrcanada@beazley.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In consideration of the premium specified above (or in endorsement(s) attached hereto), this document certifies that insurance has been effected under Policy No. GENESIS2012/19 of the Genesis Reciprocal Insurance Exchange and Policy No. 55900031 of Beazley Canada Ltd., full copies may be seen at the offices of the RMA Insurance of Nisku, Alberta and/or Aon Reed Stenhouse Inc. of Edmonton, AB for the account of the above Certificate

Genesis Reciprocal Insurance Exchange

AON REED STENHOUSE INC.
(Authorized Agent of Subscribing Insurers)

2510 Sparrow Drive, Nisku, Alberta T9E 8N5 • Phone: (780) 955-3639 Fax: (780) 955-3615

This policy contains a clause which may limit the amount payable
### Actual 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-PW5780 - EMERGENCY ROAD REPAIR...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-BEN - 131 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</td>
<td>14,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-SAL - 111 SALARIES &amp; BENEFITS</td>
<td>70,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-100 - SALARIES WAGES &amp; BENEFITS</td>
<td>84,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-CONT - 239 CONTRACT PAYMENTS</td>
<td>3,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-EQMT - 268 C10 EQUIPMENT COSTS (PY)</td>
<td>124,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-RENT - 263 EQUIPMENT RENTAL</td>
<td>3,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-200 - CONTRACTED &amp; GENERAL SERV...</td>
<td>131,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-CULV - 533 CULVERTS</td>
<td>4,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-SUPG - 515 GENERAL SUPPLIES</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-TONN - 534 GRAVEL MATERIAL</td>
<td>84,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-500 - MATERIALS SUPPLIES UTILITIES</td>
<td>89,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Expense</td>
<td>305,284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Emergency Operations**

**In incurred costs:**

- Div 6 - $32,300
- Div 7 - $305,300

**Total** $337,600
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-PW5680</td>
<td>EMERGENCY ROAD REPAIR...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-BEN</td>
<td>131 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-SAL</td>
<td>111 SALARIES &amp; BENEFITS</td>
<td>5,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-100</td>
<td>SALARIES WAGES &amp; BENEFITS</td>
<td>6,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-CONT</td>
<td>239 CONTRACT PAYMENTS</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-EQMT</td>
<td>268 C10 EQUIPMENT COSTS (PY)</td>
<td>12,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-200</td>
<td>CONTRACTED &amp; GENERAL SERV...</td>
<td>12,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-TONN</td>
<td>534 GRAVEL MATERIAL</td>
<td>13,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-500</td>
<td>MATERIALS SUPPLIES UTILITIES</td>
<td>13,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROJECT 1: Gravel Road Reclamation (Divisions 6 and 7)

**LOCATION:**
The affected area within the County of Wetaskiwin is isolated to our Divisions 6 and 7. The storm(s) affected an area from Range Road 3 west to Range Road 8 (West of the Fifth Meridian), and from Township Road 45 to Township Road 47 (West of the Fifth Meridian). An area measured at approximately 1,100 km².

**DESCRIPTION OF DAMAGE:**
The western region of the County of Wetaskiwin is made up of forest and grassland. It has significant topographical relief with many large watersheds that deliver water to Wolf Creek, Horseshoe Creek and to Washout Creek. The rainstorm overwhelmed drainage courses, ditch conveyance systems and culverts. This resulted in high velocity water flowing on or over roadways, washing out centreline culverts and causing widespread erosion to roads and ditches. Certain areas did pond as some culverts were plugged with debris and silt. The majority of the damage was caused by the velocity of the water and movement of soil material.

**EMERGENCY OPERATION COSTS:**
The damage was so widespread it took several days to respond to all sites. Some of the initial emergency repairs were to centreline culvert crossings, severely eroded roadways and road sideslopes, cutting of roadways to relieve backwater, signing and barricades, pump rental, spot gravel repair and culvert clearing. The estimated emergency operations were primarily conducted in the last two weeks of July 2019 with a total experienced cost of **$100,000**.

**INFRASTRUCTURE DAMAGE ESTIMATE**
This is difficult as the damage and loss of gravel was so widespread. However, this County will consider the reclamation work done to the end of September 2019 as complete. We have repaired most of the damaged roads with additional blading, shaping and gravel replacement. The gravel deposited to the ditch borrow and to private property will be considered permanently lost. The cleaning and clearing of our ditch borrow will take several years and this will be handled under our annual operating and road construction budgets. We are also identifying areas in which we will enhance the capacity of our culverts and drainage conveyance. We have a realized cost to the end of September 2019 of **$240,000** for the road infrastructure reclamation.
The County of Wetaskiwin makes no representation or warranties regarding the information contained in this document, including without limitation, whether said information is accurate or complete. Persons using this document do so solely at their own risk, and the County of Wetaskiwin shall have no liability to such person for any loss or damage whatsoever. This document shall not be copied or distributed to any person without the express written consent of the County of Wetaskiwin.

Copyright County of Wetaskiwin. All Rights Reserved.
### PROJECT 2: Range Road 31 – Centreline Culvert Washout

#### LOCATION:
This project is located at:
- Latitude: 52.976632 degrees
- Longitude: -114.315656 degrees
- Legal: SW 24-46-3 W5M

#### DESCRIPTION OF DAMAGE:
This centreline culvert carries a tributary to Battle Creek. The intensity of the storm(s) created high velocities in the culvert barrel and ultimately caused it uplift and separate. The stormwater then proceeded to erode around the annulus of the split barrels whereby a significant amount of the downstream road embankment was washed away.

#### EMERGENCY OPERATION COSTS:
Initial emergency operations included securing the site with barricades and signage. We did not track costs for this initial response work. The signs and barricades remained in place up to the time of the culvert replacement.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE DAMAGE ESTIMATE
Based on the size of the channel and the upstream drainage basin, a new culvert design was established. The previous 30 m x 800 mm diameter culvert is to be replaced with a new 41 m x 1200 mm diameter CSP. This work was detailed in a Request for Quotation and sent to 5 qualified third-party contractors. In September 2019, the job was awarded to Open Excavation Inc for a total bid price of $131,000. The project is now complete with additional costs incurred regarding supply of borrow material and borrow pit site reclamation costs. We expect the total costs of this large culvert replacement to be approximately **$175,000**.
### PROJECT 3: Range Road 75A – Culvert Washout and Jimbob

#### LOCATION:
This project is located at:
- Latitude: 52.85274 degrees
- Longitude: -114.992689 degrees
- Legal: NW 5-45-7 W5M

#### DESCRIPTION OF DAMAGE:
This centreline culvert carries a tributary to Wolf Creek. The intensity of the storm(s) created high velocities in the barrel and ultimately caused it to separate and break apart where only a small 6 m section directly beneath the roadbed remains. The storm flow breached the road and eroded the upstream and downstream embankment.

#### EMERGENCY OPERATION COSTS:
A portion of roadway was lost to the storm erosion so much so that each of the upstream and downstream embankments were eroded to a dangerous 0.5:1 slope. There remained about 4 m of lane to travel on (single lane only). As this condition was too dangerous to sign simply with barricades and signs, it was decided to install a Jimbob bridge to secure the site. The cost for the mobilization and installation of the Jimbob bridge was **$45,000**. The Jimbob bridge was a spare unit owned and supplied by the County of Wetaskiwin.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE DAMAGE ESTIMATE
The area has now been stabilized by the County’s Jimbob bridge. The plan is to keep the Jimbob in place as a permanent measure considering the location and traffic volumes of this road. To help prevent another flood from washing over the road and losing the Jimbob bridge, it is proposed to:
- Clean up and dispose of the damaged and severed culvert segments; remove a large wooden debris blockage on the upstream side;
- Reinforce the remaining culvert with embankment restoration (limited to 1.5:1) repair scour holes and add riprap to each culvert end ($45,000);
As an inventory Jimbob was put into service, this claim is asking for its replacement ($120,000). Total infrastructure damage estimate is **$165,000** for this project.
### PROJECT 4: Township Road 461 – Centreline Culvert Washout

#### LOCATION:
This project is located at:
- Latitude: 52.938854 degrees
- Longitude: -115.004095 degrees
- Legal: NE 6-46-7 W5M

#### DESCRIPTION OF DAMAGE:
This centreline culvert carries a tributary to Wolf Creek. The intensity of the storm(s) overwhelmed the culvert and washed over the road. The stormwater eroded a significant amount of the road, downstream embankment and much of the centreline culvert was broke apart and washed downstream.

#### EMERGENCY OPERATION COSTS:
Initial emergency operations included barricades and signage to secure the site. We did not track costs for this initial response work. The signs and barricades will remain in place up to the time of culvert replacement.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE DAMAGE ESTIMATE
Based on the size of the channel and the upstream drainage basin, a new culvert design is established. The previous 20 m x 600 mm diameter culvert is to be replaced with twin 1100 mm diameter x 35 m long diameter CSP’s. This work will be detailed in a Tender and posted on the Alberta Purchasing Connection (APC) or issued as a Request for Proposal. There will be a need for borrow material and the County will negotiate this from the adjacent landowners. We expect the total costs of this large culvert replacement to be approximately **$200,000**.
**PROJECT 5:** Rose Creek Road – Flood Damage Repair

**LOCATION:**
This project is located at:
- Latitude: 52.9312514 degrees
- Longitude: -115.008254 degrees
- Legal: NW 31-45-7 W5M

**DESCRIPTION OF DAMAGE:**
Rose Creek Road is a highly travelled high-grade paved road. It is a west extension of Hwy 13 and is one of few links to Clearwater County. The storm event sent a high volume of water towards this road which resulted in significant damage and erosion to its south ditch. The erosion and water volumes removed material, removed rock check dams, uprooted trees and created large scour holes. The water ultimately flowed towards Wolf Creek just upstream of the bridge crossing where the creek channel and material supporting the east abutment of Bridge File 72784 was all lost to the flood.

**EMERGENCY OPERATION COSTS:**
As the pavement along the west shoulder of Rose Creek Road was severely compromised by the loss of material supporting the shoulder sideslope, County crews immediately hauled in and placed material to the pavement edge and sideslope. Without this emergency measure, the travelling public would be at risk and the County would have lost expensive infrastructure. The cost for the sideslope recovery of Rose Creek Road is estimated at **$35,000** which included labour, material and equipment.

**INFRASTRUCTURE DAMAGE ESTIMATE**
To reclaim the affected area along Rose Creek Road and BF 72784 will involve salvage and redistribution of scoured material back to the ditch bottom, sideslope and backslope; reinstallation of rock check dams; repair of centreline and approach culverts; haul in or excavate additional borrow material to rebuild the road ditch and channel of Wolf Creek; removal of downed trees and re-establishment of fencing. The estimated cost for the reclamation work is **$200,000**.
REPORT: Request for Quotation Award – 2020 Bridge Maintenance Contract

Meeting Date (Report Reference Only): February 27, 2020

Meeting (Report Reference Only): Council Public Works

Background

At the January 29, 2020 Council General Budget meeting, Council approved the Funded Projects, which included $265,000 for Engineering and contract payments for the 2020 Bridge Maintenance Contract. (Ref. Resolution CG20200129.008)

WSP prepared a Request for Quotation (RFQ) for the 2020 Bridge Maintenance Contract to complete the following Bridge and Bridge Sized Culvert Repairs and Other Work:

**Bridge File 1318:**
Bigstone Creek Bridge on Local Road Near Wetaskiwin
Legal Land Description: WSW 23-46-26-W4

**Bridge File 1406:**
Bigstone Creek Bridge on Local Road Near Brightview
Legal Land Description: WNW 27-46-25-W4

**Bridge File 2391:**
Pigeon Creek Bridge on Local Road Near Falun
Legal Land Description: SSW 30-45-27-W4

**Bridge File 75951:**
Watercourse Bridge on Local Road Near Pendryl
Legal Land Description: SSW 5-46-5 W5

**Bridge File 77164:**
Watercourse Culvert on Local Road, 21km North of Alder Flats
Legal Land Description: SNE 19-45-7 W5

**Bridge File 78835:**
Washout Creek Culvert on Local Road, 21km North of Alder Flats
Legal Land Description: SSE 4-47-7 W5
Invitational RFQ's were sent out with four (4) companies providing bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volker Stevin Highways Ltd.</td>
<td>$144,970.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham Excavating Ltd.</td>
<td>$157,033.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgemen Services Ltd.</td>
<td>$186,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula Alberta</td>
<td>$297,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WSP has reviewed the quotations and recommend the contract be awarded to Volker Stevin Highways Ltd. for the low bid of $144,970.04. The anticipated total project cost is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Various Bridge Files</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$144,970.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>$14,497.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering budget (July 5, 2019)</td>
<td>$26,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS (excluding GST)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$185,907.04</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

The 3203: Funded Projects 2020 budget allowed for a total of $265,000 inclusive of contract work, engineering and contingencies. The expected project total of $186,000 is well within budget and does allow PW to incorporate other bridge repairs as they often tend to appear once the work commences.

**Recommended Resolution**

that Council award the 2020 Bridge Maintenance Contract to Volker Stevin Highways Ltd. for the low bid of $144,970.04.
February 10, 2020

County of Wetaskiwin No. 10
P.O. Box 6960
Wetaskiwin, AB T9A 2G5

ATTENTION:  Mr. Neil Powell, P.Eng., Director of Public Works
Mr. Brian Anderson, Assistant Director of Public Works

RE:  Contract No. 191-13490-00
2020 Bridge Maintenance Contract
Bridge and Bridge Sized Culvert Repairs and Other Work

Quotes have been received from a total of four (4) contractors for the above-noted project on February 6, 2020. The low quotation is from Volker Stevin Highways Ltd. with a total quotation value of $144,970.04. We have reviewed the bid from Volker Stevin Highways Ltd. and have found they have substantially met the requirements at the bid stage. If awarded to the low bidder, the anticipated expenditures for this project are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$144,970.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>$14,497.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Budget (July 5, 2019)</td>
<td>$26,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$185,907.04</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GST is not included in these totals

We are requesting your Council's decision regarding the awarding of this contract to Volker Stevin Highways Ltd. Attached for your information are the Quote Results and the complete Quotation Summary for the summarized totals for the six Bridge Files.

Yours truly,

Kurt Petrica, P. Eng.

Attachments

cc:  Delores Deblois, County of Wetaskiwin No. 10
     Nathan MacLeod, C.E.T., Area Manager, WSP
     Ming Jiao, P. Eng., Bridge Group - Team Lead, Red Deer, WSP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Amount Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volker Stevin Highways Ltd.</td>
<td>$144,970.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham Homes Ltd.</td>
<td>$157,033.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgemen Services Ltd.</td>
<td>$186,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula Alberta Ltd.</td>
<td>$297,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Tender Received From:

Volker Stevin Highways Ltd.  $144,970.04
Tender Results – One New Aluminum Tridem Two Compartment Water/Calcium Tankard Trailer - Report

Meeting Date (Report Reference Only): February 27, 2020

Meeting (Report Reference Only): Council Public Works

Background
At the January 29, 2020 Council General Budget meeting, Council approved the 2020 Operating and Capital Budget as amended, which included a budget amount of $260,000 for the disposal and replacement of the 2009 Water/Calcium Tankard Trailer. (CG20200129.008)

Administration prepared and advertised an Invitation to Tender which closed on Wednesday, February 12, 2020 with the following two bids received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Trailer Sales and Leasing Ltd.</td>
<td>$210,195.00 plus GST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldec-Hamm’s Manufacturing Ltd.</td>
<td>$229,706.00 plus GST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations
Administration has reviewed the tenders and recommends awarding the tender for the purchase of one new aluminum tridem two compartment water/calcium tankard trailer to the low bid of $210,195.00 from Edmonton Trailer Sales and Leasing Ltd.

Recommended Resolution
that Council approve awarding the tender to the low bid of $210,195.00 from Edmonton Trailer Sales and Leasing Ltd. for the purchase of one new aluminum tridem two compartment water/calcium tankard trailer.
Background

At the January 29, 2020 Council General Budget Meeting, Council approved the 2020 Operating and Capital budget which included funding for a total of $1,645,000 for the following two projects:

- PW73032 - Schedule A – TWP RD 464 – Golf Course Road from RGE RD 245 to RGE RD 244 (1.80km)
- PW3741 - Schedule B – RGE RD 63 – (Buck Lake) from Junction of HWY 13 to North of 2nd Ave West (2.62km)
(Ref. Resolution CG20200129.008)

The design and tender completed by WSP Canada Inc. was advertised on the Alberta Purchasing Connection and in the Pipestone Flyer newspaper. The tender closed on Thursday, February 13, 2020 with the following bids received from a total of eight (8) bidders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Amount Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Civil Solutions Inc.</td>
<td>$1,697,490.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahrmann Construction</td>
<td>$1,701,080.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City Asphalt Ltd.</td>
<td>$1,704,733.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Paving</td>
<td>$1,799,193.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Construction</td>
<td>$1,800,261.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmack's Enterprises</td>
<td>$2,103,004.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaFarge</td>
<td>$2,491,804.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park-Aid Asphalt &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>$2,815,758.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WSP has reviewed the tender documents noting that the low bidder for this project was Central Civil Solutions Inc. with a total tender bid of $1,697,490.26. However, when considering site days bid, engineering costs, tender rank (rating guide) and total project costs, the bid from Lahrmann Construction Inc. proves to be the most economical.
WSP has prepared a project costing scenario for each of the two lowest bids from Central Civil Solutions Inc. and Lahrmann Construction Inc. It is recommended to award the contract to Lahrmann Construction Inc.

If awarded to the low compliant bidder based on total tender value alone, **Central Civil Solutions Inc.**, the anticipated funding required for this project would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Schedule &quot;A&quot;</th>
<th>Schedule &quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs (Less Site Occ.)</td>
<td>$ 869,242.56</td>
<td>$ 745,747.70</td>
<td>$ 1,614,990.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (5%)</td>
<td>$ 43,462.13</td>
<td>$ 37,287.39</td>
<td>$ 80,749.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Site Occ. Bonus (6 days @1,500/day)</td>
<td>$ 4,500.00</td>
<td>$ 4,500.00</td>
<td>$ 9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential ACP (EPS) Bonus</td>
<td>$ 11,520.00</td>
<td>$ 12,452.00</td>
<td>$ 23,972.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Engineering Cost</td>
<td>$ 106,280.50</td>
<td>$ 100,337.00</td>
<td>$ 206,617.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,035,005.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 900,324.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,935,329.27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The above totals do not include GST*

If awarded to the low bidder based on the Rating Guide, **Lahrmann Construction Inc.**, the anticipated funding required for this project is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Schedule &quot;A&quot;</th>
<th>Schedule &quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs (Less Site Occ.)</td>
<td>$ 892,912.00</td>
<td>$ 752,668.60</td>
<td>$ 1,645,580.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (5%)</td>
<td>$ 44,645.60</td>
<td>$ 37,633.43</td>
<td>$ 82,279.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Site Occ. Bonus (4 days @1,500/day)</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
<td>$ 6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential ACP (EPS) Bonus</td>
<td>$ 11,520.00</td>
<td>$ 12,452.00</td>
<td>$ 23,972.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Engineering Cost</td>
<td>$ 90,952.00</td>
<td>$ 79,676.00</td>
<td>$ 170,628.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,043,029.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 885,430.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,928,459.63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The above totals do not include GST*

**FINANCIAL:**

The 2020 Public Works budget allowed for a total of $1,645,000 for both projects. When using Lahrmann’s bid, the total anticipated project costs inclusive of contract, engineering, bonuses and contingencies is $1,928,460 which is $283,460 over budget. During detailed design, the scope of work on the Golf Course Road expanded to deal with drainage issues and new culvert installations. Due to this, the project costs have exceeded the initial budget estimate. In addition, the unit price of asphalt from all bidders was significantly higher than expected. Note: there is an option to reduce the scope of work on the Golf Course Road, but it is recommended that drainage improvements are implemented to maintain road subgrade integrity and protection of the pavement structure.
The 2020 PW budget drew from reserves for each of these projects. To fund a budget shortfall, there is a need to draw additionally from reserves and is a recommended action. The additional amount required may be less than $283,460 as the contract bid amount did allow for approximately $80,000 in contingencies which may not be expended.

**Recommendations**

Administration recommends that the contract for Asphalt Concrete Pavement (EPS) and Other Work as detailed in Contract and Specifications for Schedule A – TWP RD 464 – Golf Course Road from RGE RD 245 to RGE RD 244 (1.80km) and Schedule B – RGE RD 63 – (Buck Lake) from Junction of HWY 13 to North of 2nd Ave West (2.62km) be awarded to Lahrmann Construction Inc. and their bid of $1,701,080.60.

**Recommended Resolution**

THAT Council award the contract for Asphalt Concrete Pavement and Other Work for Range Road 63, from Hwy 13 north to 2nd Ave West in Buck Lake (a distance of 2.62 km); and the Golf Course Road, from Range Road 245 to the Peace Hills entrance (a distance of 1.8 km) - to Lahrmann Construction Inc. in the amount of $1,701,080.60 and approve total project costs of $1,928,460 which is inclusive of contract costs, engineering, bonuses and contingencies; and that if required, budget over expenditures up to $284,000 to be withdrawn from the Public Works – Paved Contingency Reserve.
ATTENTION: Mr. Brian Anderson, Assistant Director of Public Works

RE: 2020 Local Road Paving
Schedule “A” – Township Road 464 (Golf Course Road)
Schedule “B” – Range Road 63 (Buck Lake)
Asphalt Concrete Pavement (EPS) and Other Work
Contract No. 191-13858-00

Tenders were received for the above-noted project on February 13, 2020 from a total of eight (8) bidders. The low bidder was Central Civil Solutions Inc. with a total tender value of $1,697,490.26. We have viewed the bid submitted by Central Civil Solutions Inc. and have found they met the required contractual obligations at the bid stage.

If awarded to the low compliant bidder based on total tender value alone, Central Civil Solutions Inc., the anticipated funding required for this project would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Schedule &quot;A&quot;</th>
<th>Schedule &quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs (Less Site Occ.)</td>
<td>$ 869,242.56</td>
<td>$ 745,747.70</td>
<td>$ 1,614,990.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (5%)</td>
<td>$ 43,462.13</td>
<td>$ 37,287.39</td>
<td>$ 80,749.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Site Occ. Bonus (4 days @1,500/day)</td>
<td>$ 4,500.00</td>
<td>$ 4,500.00</td>
<td>$ 9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential ACP (EPS) Bonus</td>
<td>$ 11,520.00</td>
<td>$ 12,452.00</td>
<td>$ 23,972.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Engineering Cost</td>
<td>$ 106,280.50</td>
<td>$ 100,337.00</td>
<td>$ 206,617.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,055,005.19</td>
<td>$ 900,324.09</td>
<td><strong>$ 1,935,329.27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above totals do not include GST

The second low bidder based on tender price alone was Lahrmann Construction Inc. with a total tender value of $1,701,080.60. However, if the County of Wetaskiwin follows Section 1.9 Rating Guide, their score on the Rating Guide could place them as the potential successful bidder. We have viewed the bid submitted by Lahrmann Construction Inc. and have found they also met the required contractual obligations at the bid stage.

If awarded to the low bidder based on the Rating Guide, Lahrmann Construction Inc., the anticipated funding required for this project is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Schedule &quot;A&quot;</th>
<th>Schedule &quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs (Less Site Occ.)</td>
<td>$ 892,912.00</td>
<td>$ 752,668.60</td>
<td>$ 1,645,580.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (5%)</td>
<td>$ 44,645.60</td>
<td>$ 37,633.43</td>
<td>$ 82,279.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Site Occ. Bonus (4 days @1,500/day)</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
<td>$ 6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential ACP (EPS) Bonus</td>
<td>$ 11,520.00</td>
<td>$ 12,452.00</td>
<td>$ 23,972.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Engineering Cost</td>
<td>$ 90,952.00</td>
<td>$ 79,676.00</td>
<td>$ 170,628.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,043,029.60</td>
<td>$ 885,430.03</td>
<td><strong>$ 1,928,459.63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above totals do not include GST
Your council’s decision regarding the awarding of this contract to either Central Civil Solutions Inc. or Lahrmann Construction Inc. is hereby requested. The complete listing of the tender results and the complete tender summary along with the proposed work schedule, reference list, and equipment list provided by Central Civil Solutions and Lahrmann Construction are attached for your information along with the Rating Guide in which the County should insert a value for Past Performance with the different bidders. We have used the low total tender price as receiving the full 25% and have compared the other bids to that using per-centages.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Nathan MacLeod, C.E.T., Area Manager, WSP

Attachments

/da

c: Mike Goldade, Regional Manager, WSP
Tender Results – 2020 Road Construction Projects - Report

Meeting Date (Report Reference Only): February 27, 2020
Meeting (Report Reference Only): Council Public Works

Background
At the January 29, 2020 Council General Budget Meeting, Council approved the 2020 Operating and Capital budget which included funding for a total of $1,457,500 for the following two projects:

- PW67062 - Schedule A – TWP RD 464 – Deuce Auto Road from RGE RD 73 to HWY 22 Clay Cap and Stabilization (4.906km)
- PW62053 - Schedule B – RGE RD 232 – Sod Farm Hill Road- Along NW ¼ 2-47-23 W4M.

(Ref. Resolution CG20200129.008)

The design and tender completed by ROHI Engineering was advertised on the Alberta Purchasing Connection and in the Pipestone Flyer newspaper. The tender closed on Wednesday, February 19, 2020 with the following bids received from a total of seven bidders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidders Name</th>
<th>Schedule A</th>
<th>Schedule B</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSA Construction Inc.</td>
<td>$1,268,112.75</td>
<td>$91,032.00</td>
<td>$1,359,144.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie North Construction Ltd.</td>
<td>$1,154,945.00</td>
<td>$212,675.00</td>
<td>$1,367,620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norellco Contractors Ltd.</td>
<td>$1,227,579.00</td>
<td>$162,430.50</td>
<td>$1,390,009.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Erectors International</td>
<td>$1,314,911.00</td>
<td>$161,480.00</td>
<td>$1,476,391.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Construction Group</td>
<td>$1,362,800.00</td>
<td>$148,293.00</td>
<td>$1,511,093.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crow Enterprises</td>
<td>$1,429,331.50</td>
<td>$165,712.00</td>
<td>$1,595,043.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBL Construction</td>
<td>$1,466,345.00</td>
<td>$155,570.00</td>
<td>$1,621,915.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The low bidder for this project is PSA Construction Inc. with a total tender value of $1,359,144.75. ROHI Engineering Ltd. has reviewed the bid submitted by PSA Construction Inc. and found they have met the contractual requirements at the bid stage. However, when considering site days bid, engineering costs and tender rank, the bid from Prairie North Construction Ltd. is recommended.
ROHI Engineering Ltd. has prepared the following analysis and estimate of probable total project costs. To wit ...

We have reviewed the four (4) low bidders tenders submitted in conjunction with the County of Wetaskiwin Rating guide as set out in the tender document. After the rating was completed it was found that Prairie North Construction Ltd. had ranked the highest scoring 96.3 out of 100 total points with a bid of $1,367,620.00. We have reviewed the bid submitted by Prairie North Construction Ltd. and found they have met the contractual requirements at the bid stage.

The anticipated costs for these projects are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract 19-032- Twp Rd 464 &amp; Rge Rd 232</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Amount (Less Site Occ.)</td>
<td>$1,253,620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (5%)</td>
<td>$62,681.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Site Occ. Bonus (4 days @ 2000.00/day)</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering- All phases (Excluding Contract Admin.) Schedule A</td>
<td>$42,487.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Engineering based on Contractor days bid (45 site days) Schedule A</td>
<td>$70,498.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering- All phases (Excluding Contract Admin.) Schedule B</td>
<td>$7,135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Engineering based on Contractor days bid (12 site days) Schedule B</td>
<td>$10,064.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Signage Bonus</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,456,485.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The above totals do not include GST*

**FINANCIAL:**

The 2020 Public Works budget allowed for a total of $1,457,500 for both projects. When using Prairie North’s bid, the total anticipated project costs inclusive of contract, engineering, bonuses and contingencies is $1,456,485.75 which is just under budget.

**Recommendations**

Administration recommends that Council award the contract for 2020 Road Construction Projects, to Prairie North Construction Ltd. for the following two projects:

- PW67062 - Schedule A – TWP RD 464 – Deuce Auto Road from RGE RD 73 to HWY 22 Clay Cap and Stabilization (4.906km)
- PW62053 - Schedule B – RGE RD 232 – Sod Farm Hill Road- Along NW ¼ 2-47-23 W4M.
**Recommended Resolution**

THAT Council award the contract for 2020 Road Construction Projects - Grading, Slope Repairs and Other Work for Township Road 464 (Deuce Auto Road) from Range Road 73 to Hwy 22 (4.91 km); and Range Road 232 (Sod Farm Hill Road) - to Prairie North Construction Ltd. in the amount of $1,367,620 and approve total project costs of $1,457,000 which is inclusive of contract costs, engineering, bonuses and contingencies.
February 21, 2020

Mr. Brian Anderson
Assistant Director of Public Works
County of Wetaskiwin No. 10
Box 6960
Wetaskiwin, Alberta
T9A 2G5

Dear Mr. Anderson

RE: Tender No. 19-032- Twp. Rd. 464 and Rge. Rd. 232 Grading, Slope Repairs and Other Work

Tenders were received from a total of seven (7) bidders for the above-noted project on February 19, 2020. The low bidder for this project was **PSA Construction Inc.** with a total tender value of **$1,359,144.75**.

We have reviewed the four (4) low bidders tenders submitted in conjunction with the County of Wetaskiwin Rating guide as set out in the tender document. After the rating was completed it was found that **Prairie North Construction Ltd.** had ranked the highest scoring 96.3 out of 100 total points with a bid of **$1,367,620.00**. We have reviewed the bid submitted by **Prairie North Construction Ltd.** and found they have met the contractual requirements at the bid stage.

The anticipated costs for these projects are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract 19-032- Twp Rd 464 &amp; Rge Rd 232</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Amount (Less Site Occ.)</td>
<td>$1,253,620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (5%)</td>
<td>$62,681.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Site Occ. Bonus (4 days @ 2000.00/day)</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering- All phases (Excluding Contract Admin.) Schedule A</td>
<td>$42,487.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Engineering based on Contractor days bid (45 site days) Schedule A</td>
<td>$70,498.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering- All phases (Excluding Contract Admin.) Schedule B</td>
<td>$7,135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Engineering based on Contractor days bid (12 site days) Schedule B</td>
<td>$10,064.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Signage Bonus</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,456,485.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The above totals do not include GST*
Please inform ROHI Engineering Ltd. of your Council’s decision regarding the awarding of this Contract to Prairie North Construction Ltd. The complete listing of the Tender Results, the Tender Summary and other pertinent information from the four (4) lowest bidders have been attached to help in your decision.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Aaron Roberts, Project Manager, ROHI Engineering Ltd.

AR/ar

cc. Mr. Neil Powell, Director of Public Works
    Mr. Glen Sandin, Project Sponsor, ROHI Engineering Ltd
    Mr. Randall Trites, President, ROHI Engineering Ltd
# Reference Check

**Date:** Feb 20, 2020  
**Contract:** 19-032  
**Client:** County of Wetaskiwin  
**Contractor:** Prairie North

**Questioning of:** - Mark Greibrok of the MD of Wainwright (780) 842-0486 Replies in Red  
**Questioning of:** - Owen Francis from the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Alberta) (403) 854-5603. Replies in Blue. Owen was unavailable until next week. Shawn Kovitch the Roads Superintendent for Special Areas was also involved in the project. Shawn gave the reference check.  
**Questioning of:** -Gail Corruthers of the RM of Frenchman Butte (Saskatchewan) (306) 344-2034 Replies in Green.

**Reference check performed by:** Aaron Roberts- ROHI Engineering Ltd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What was the nature of the project the Contractor performed for your group? Was it Civil/Earthworks? | - Grading  
  - Grading- rebuild and widening for future soil stabilization.  
  - Grading- gravel reconstruction. Road widening and clay cap and 7-8 2700mm CSP Instalations |
| 2. Did the Contractor Complete the project on time?                      | - Yes  
  - Yes, two-year project.  
  - Yes, if not, major weather delays and 1 pipeline needed to be lowered. All out of PN’s control |
| 3. Did the Contractor complete the project on budget?                    | - Yes, it close  
  - He believes so.  
  - Yes |
| 4. Did the Contractor push for unjustified Extra Work?                   | - No  
  - Tried but the work was in scope  
  - No |
| 5. Did the Contractor employ competent Foreman/Workers/Subcontractors?   | - Yes  
  - Yes, seasonal operators.  
  - Yes |
| 6. Did the Contractor have suitable/proper machinery to complete the required work? | - Yes  
  - Lightly equipped to start off, more equipment brought to rectify the issue. Some delays but good once got going.  
  - Yes, very good |
| 7. Was the Contractor familiar with the Specifications and Requirements of the Owner? | - Yes  
  - Yes  
  - Yes |
8. Any issues with claims against the Contractor for the project (Subcontractors/suppliers etc.)?
   - No
   - No
   - No

9. How was the Contractors Safety Program? Did it perform well? (Rate 1-10) 1- poor, 10- perfect
   - 8
   - 8.5 no incidents. Wood group was in charge.
   - At least an 8. No issues at all.

10. What is your overall assessment of the Contractor and would you have them perform work for you again? (Rate 1-5) 1- poor, 5- perfect
    - 5, Absolutely, would have them again in a heartbeat
    - 3.5, He would have them again for sure.
    - 4.5, She would have them again for sure
**Reference Check**

Date: Feb 20, 2020  
Contract: 19-032  
Client: County of Wetaskiwin  
Contractor: Norellco Contractors Ltd.

**Questioning of:** - Glenn Newman of Wood Group (780) 436-2152 Replies in Red. Left message for Glenn to return my call @10:26am  
- Bruno St. Amand of Tetra Tech (780) 451-2130. Replies in Blue. Bruno no longer works for this company.  
Alternate contact for a different project used:  
- Darcy Taylor of ARA Engineering (403) 735-6030 Replies in Blue. Darcy no longer works for this company.  
Alternate contact for another different project used:  
- Gord Holman of Wood Group (780) 499-3729 Replies in Blue.  
- Greg Sheppard of SE Design (780) 594-5380 Replies in Green.  
Reference check performed by: Aaron Roberts- ROHI Engineering Ltd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What was the nature of the project the Contractor performed for your group? Was it Civil/Earthworks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grading 9km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grading rebuilt, existing cold mix. Culvert installations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Did the Contractor Complete the project on time?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did the Contractor complete the project on budget?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did the Contractor push for unjustified Extra Work?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, reasonable issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did the Contractor employ competent Foreman/Workers/Subcontractors?</td>
<td>Yes, Older Foreman made it happen. He was hard on the boys (his workers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did the Contractor have suitable/proper machinery to complete the required work?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was the Contractor familiar with the Specifications and Requirements of the Owner?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Any Issues with claims against the Contractor for the project (Subcontractors/suppliers etc.)?
   • Yes
   • No

9. How was the Contractors Safety Program? Did it perform well? (Rate 1-10) 1- poor, 10- perfect
   • 9 No issues at all
   • 7.5, there was 1 powerline strike

10. What is your overall assessment of the Contractor and would you have them perform work for you again? (Rate 1-5) 1- poor, 5- perfect
    • 5 would work again but the older Foreman was absolutely what made the job.
    • 4 would work again, invites sent regularly.
Date: Feb 20, 2020
Contract: 19-032
Client: County of Wetaskiwin
Contractor: Prairie Erectors International

Alternate used
Questioning of: Chase Johnson of MPA Engineering (780) 416-3224 Replies in Red. Left voicemail at 11:46am

Questioning of: - Doug Vint of WSP (403) 342-7650 Replies in Blue.
Questioning of: - Bernie Roseke of Roseke Engineering (403) 942-6170 Replies in Green.
Reference check performed by: Aaron Roberts- ROHI Engineering Ltd.

1. What was the nature of the project the Contractor performed for your group? Was it Civil/Earthworks?
   - BF Replacement
   - BF replacement

2. Did the Contractor Complete the project on time?
   - Yes
   - Yes

3. Did the Contractor complete the project on budget?
   - Yes
   - Yes

4. Did the Contractor push for unjustified Extra Work?
   - No
   - No

5. Did the Contractor employ competent Foreman/Workers/Subcontractors?
   - Yes
   - Yes

6. Did the Contractor have suitable/proper machinery to complete the required work?
   - Yes
   - Yes

7. Was the Contractor familiar with the Specifications and Requirements of the Owner?
   - Yes
   - Yes

8. Any Issues with claims against the Contractor for the project (Subcontractors/suppliers etc.)?
9. How was the Contractors Safety Program? Did it perform well? (Rate 1-10) 1- poor, 10- perfect
   • 8.5, Better than most
   • 10

10. What is your overall assessment of the Contractor and would you have them perform work for you again? (Rate 1-5) 1- poor, 5- perfect
    • 5, The best he works with
    • 5 Yes
Reference Check

Date: Feb 20, 2020
Contract: 19-032
Client: County of Wetaskiwin
Contractor: PSA Construction Inc.

Questioning of: - Sue Howard of the City of Wetaskiwin (780) 361-4409 Replies in Red. Left message @8:39am Feb 20, 2020. Requested a call back. Tyler Wood the PM for the work called me back.
Questioning of: - Drew Fellers of MPE Engineering (780) 717-9714 Replies in Blue
Reference check performed by: Aaron Roberts- ROHI Engineering Ltd.

1. What was the nature of the project the Contractor performed for your group? Was it Civil/Earthworks?
   - 3 projects. Mostly underground sani/storm and utilities. Some grading components
   - Underground utilities for the most part – Directional drilling. Fire suppression system. Mostly municipal

2. Did the Contractor Complete the project on time?
   - 2 projects-Yes/ 2 projects- No still some incomplete work that is becoming difficult to get them to finish.
   - No, PSA was the General Contractor, subs performed poorly. Fired them bought their own equipment delayed the project a season essentially.

3. Did the Contractor complete the project on budget?
   - 2-Yes and 2- No
   - Yes, it was over but was close.

4. Did the Contractor push for unjustified Extra Work?
   - Yes, did not have a specialty tool and expected the City to buy the tool.
   - No, standard issues but nothing too major.

5. Did the Contractor employ competent Foreman/Workers/Subcontractors?
   - Issues with Sub-contractors and quality control issues
   - Not too bad, after the fact found that some services were installed wrong but decent guys to work with.

6. Did the Contractor have suitable/proper machinery to complete the required work?
   - No
   - Yes

7. Was the Contractor familiar with the Specifications and Requirements of the Owner?
   - No
   - Yes
8. Any Issues with claims against the Contractor for the project (Subcontractors/suppliers etc.)?
   • No, not completed yet though.
   • No

9. How was the Contractors Safety Program? Did it perform well? (Rate 1-10) 1- poor, 10- perfect
   • 5- Very average
   • 6’ish range

10. What is your overall assessment of the Contractor and would you have them perform work for you again? (Rate 1-5) 1- poor, 5- perfect
    • 1.5, No the City would not hire them again.
    • 3, Yes, but their owner is very tough to work with and a total loudmouth as long as he isn’t involved it goes better.
## 19-032 County of Wetaskiwin Twp Rd 464 and Rge Rd 232 Rating Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>PSA Construction Inc.</th>
<th>Prairie North</th>
<th>Norellco Contractors Ltd.</th>
<th>Prairie Erectors International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Tendered Price</strong> (25 points)</td>
<td>$1,359,144.75</td>
<td>$1,367,620.00</td>
<td>$1,390,009.50</td>
<td>$1,476,391.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 point per $20,000.00 difference from low bid. Maximum 25 pts, Minimum 0 pts allowable</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience with similar work</strong> (25 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference check on each bidders experience and capability to do the project. 10 base points for listed projects involving civil/earthwork construction that aligns with this projects scope, 5 points for each positive reference check, 3 for neutral and 0 for bad (Total the 3 references and add to base point score=value to enter for this score)</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past Performance with the County and/or references</strong> (25 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 base points for no prior experience 1-10 points for quality/outcome of past experience from County and/or references</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start and Completion Dates</strong> (15 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>List of Equipment Dedicated to the Project</strong> (10 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points (100)</strong></td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. In event of a tie after the initial scoring is completed, Total Tendered Price will be revisited. The lowest bid shall become 1st (or the next highest) place in the ranking.
2. Experience with similar work- 3 points for neutral could be in result of referencer not returning a message from ROHI to perform the ref. check.