

Deputation – S McPherson Lawn & Snow Service Inc.  
Item 15B – Vendor Award: Grounds Maintenance & Snow Clearing Services  
Program TCHC BOARD Public Meeting – February 13, 2025

February 12, 2025

To: TCHC Board of Directors  
Board Meeting February 13, 2025

Re: Deputation Item 15B – Vendor Award: Annual Grounds Maintenance & Snow Clearing Services Program

I am writing to you in regards to the Evaluation Process for RFP 24116 - Annual Grounds Maintenance & Snow Clearing Stage 2 Rated Criteria

On November 18, 2024, a proponent that submitted their tender for RFP 24116 called me and informed me that they and 2 other proponents failed Stage 2 Rated Criteria where proponents had to receive a minimum score of 70 out of 100 to pass. This information was not public at the time. Throughout their conversation they stated they had an inside person who provided them with this information. To be clear this proponent contacted me and gave me this information on their own accord.

As well this inside person specifically told the proponent where they failed on Stage 2 Rated Criteria. Note to pass must receive a minimum of 70 points out of 100. Stage 2 of the Evaluation Process shows you are capable to perform the scope of work and if you did not pass this stage the Pricing Form C cannot be opened.

This proponent was told they failed on the following items:

- 1) Experience and Qualifications 1.1 Relevant Experience; Proponents are requested to provide a total of two (2) programs similar in type, scope, and complexity to the scope of work described within this RFP. Each Program worth 18 points for a total of 36 points plus 4 points for company value for a total of 40 points for this section.

Proponents MUST submit the following information for each program

- a) Name of Program;
- b) Location of Program
- c) Program contact name, telephone number and email address
- d) Annual Value of Program

- e) Detailed description of deliverables or services delivered as it relates to the scope of work in the RFP
- f) Number of full-time staff allocated
- g) Number of years working with the client (including start/end date);  
Responsiveness to clients
- h) Ability to complete jobs on schedule and on budget

For the 2 Programs this contractor told me they only submitted the current RFPs for the 2 Groups they are currently working on and no further details.

- 2) 2.0 Organizational Chart and Key Personnel: They were required to provide an organizational chart as it pertained to mandatory requirements stated in the RFP as well as 3 specific resumes. Worth 10 points. They listed their entire company's organizational chart and were missing the lines from box to box.
- 3) 5.0 Equipment Listed; Proponents have to show they have the mandatory requirements for trucks and specific equipment depending which area is to be awarded. This proponent told me they were informed that they listed all of their equipment instead of the requirements on the submission form. Worth 10 points

According to this proponent they failed on the items listed above which have a total value of 60 points. As stated to pass Stage 2 proponents need a minimum score of 70 out of 100 to pass. This would mean the proponent would need a perfect score on the remaining 40 points for Delivery of Services 30 points and Scheduling 10 points to pass.

This proponent told me they going to dispute the results which are not public and while the Evaluation Process was still going on. Then on November 20, 2024 they called me again and said their inside person told them all 3 proponents were re-evaluated (given a second evaluation for Stage 2 Rated Criteria) and now they passed. Note: "Rated Criteria documents are not rectifiable."

Why were they given the information on where they failed while the Evaluation Process was still in progress? Was there undue pressure/influence from the

inside person to change the results of the evaluation in Stage 2? Would the evaluation team have to document that proponents were re-evaluated with explanations as to why didn't pass first time and why passed after re-evaluated? I am bringing this to your attention and would like to know where in the tender does it state that if a proponent fails Stage 2 Rated Criteria they get a second evaluation?

As you are about to award \$72,709,420.29 contract and under the shadow of possibility of impropriety in the evaluation process in Stage 2 Rated Criteria and proponents being awarded contracts who may or may not have passed Stage 2 Rated Criteria and may have been re-evaluated and passed, would it not be prudent for the Board of Directors or an independent group of people with no affiliation to this Evaluation Process review all 11 proponents Stage 2 Rated Criteria and compare the content and scores to confirm/verify accuracy of the scores given or re-score not knowing current scores to make sure it was fair and equal among all proponents before this contract is awarded.

As work for this contract commences May 1, 2025 there is sufficient time to review and or re-score Stage 2 Rated Criteria to alleviate possibility of impropriety.

Regards,

Sean McPherson  
President  
S. McPherson Lawn & Snow Service Inc.