

# Memorandum to the Council of Corporation of the Municipality of Temagami

---

**Subject:** Evaluation of Proposals – Realtor of Record Services

**Memo No:** 2025-M-100

**Date:** April 24, 2025

**Attachment:** None

**Prepared By:** Laala Jahanshahloo - CAO/Treasurer

## Recommendation

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council receives Memo 2025-M-100 as presented;

AND FURTHER THAT Council selects the Realtor of Record based on the information presented;

AND FURTHER THAT Council considers a By-law to authorize execution of the necessary agreement with the selected firm.

## Contents

1. Executive Summary .....	2
2. Background.....	2
3. Weighted Scoring Matrix.....	3
4. Scenario-Based Evaluation .....	3
5. Objective-Oriented Scoring.....	3
6. Capability Maturity Assessment.....	4
7. Cost Comparison .....	4
8. Key Considerations for Council .....	4
9. Conclusion .....	5

## 1. Executive Summary

The Municipality of Temagami issued RFP #2025-01 to secure a Realtor of Record for the marketing and sale of surplus properties, including waterfront and tax sale lands. In accordance with Council's direction to ensure an impartial review, four proposals were evaluated anonymously using coded references (P#1–P#4). P#1 emerged as the top candidate, offering national reach, compliance, and robust marketing. P#2 and P#3 demonstrated regional strengths but lagged in innovation. The corresponding Confidential Proposal Key shall be retained by the Clerk and CAO, and shall not be disclosed during public Council proceedings. It will only be revealed after Council has reached a formal decision on the selected proposal.

## 2. Background

RFP #2025-01 was issued to retain a Realtor of Record to support the Municipality's objectives relating to surplus property divestment, financial recovery, and strategic outreach. To preserve impartiality, all submissions were anonymized. Evaluation criteria were based on qualifications, marketing strategies, cost, references, and organizational strength, as outlined in the RFP.

To ensure an impartial and merit-based review, Council directed that all proposals be anonymized using proposal codes (P#1–P#4). The Confidential Proposal Key shall be retained by the Clerk and CAO, shall not be disclosed during public Council proceedings, and may only be revealed after Council has made a formal selection.

### 3. Weighted Scoring Matrix

Criteria	Weight (%)	P#1	P#2	P#3	P#4
Qualifications & Experience	30%	9.0	7.0	10.0	4.0
Marketing Strategy	30%	10.0	8.0	6.0	5.0
Fee Structure	20%	9.0	8.0*	6.0	3.0
References	10%	9.0	9.0	7.0	0.0
Organizational Strength	10%	10.0	7.0	6.0	3.0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>3.6</b>

### 4. Scenario-Based Evaluation

Scenario	P#1	P#2	P#3	P#4
Luxury Waterfront Sale	10/10	7/10	6/10	5/10
Tax Arrears Recovery	8/10	9/10	9/10	4/10
Out-of-Province Buyers	10/10	6/10	3/10	7/10
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>

### 5. Objective-Oriented Scoring

Scoring is based on qualitative alignment with RFP objectives, where 1 = limited, 2 = moderate, 3 = strong alignment.

Objective	P#1	P#2	P#3	P#4
Maximize Sale Prices	3	2	2	2
Ensure Compliance	2	2	3	2
Expand Buyer Pool	3	2	1	2
<b>Total Score (9 max)</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>

## 6. Capability Maturity Assessment

Proposal	Maturity Level	Rationale
P#1	Very High	National network, strong compliance framework, Company infrastructure.
P#2	High	Strong local presence, Company backing.
P#3	Moderate	Local knowledge, traditional methods.
P#4	Low	Innovative but untested; sole proprietorship; lacks references.

## 7. Cost Comparison

Proposal	Commission	Additional Fees
P#1	5% + HST	None (all-inclusive).
P#2	TBD (negotiable)	Undefined.
P#3	5% + HST	\$400 per CMA; \$150/hr boat & \$100/hr snowmobile access.
P#4	TBD (negotiable)	Undefined.

## 8. Key Considerations for Council

- **P#1** demonstrated a high level of preparedness and capability across all scenarios, particularly in handling remote buyers and complex transactions.
- **P#2** showed strength in tax arrears recovery and traditional marketing approaches.
- **P#3** displayed a strong understanding of local processes but had limited strategies for broader market reach.
- **P#4** presented creative ideas but scored lower due to limited demonstrated experience and a lack of comparable casework.

## 9. Conclusion

This evaluation report provides a comprehensive, unbiased review of the proposals submitted under RFP #2025-01. Proponents have been anonymized using coded references (P#1 through P#4) to ensure that Council's decision is based solely on merit, alignment with municipal objectives, and service capacity.

A Confidential Proposal Key identifying each proponent has been prepared and is securely retained by the Clerk and CAO. This key will only be disclosed after Council has formally selected the successful proposal. This process ensures transparency, accountability, and impartial decision-making in accordance with Council's direction.