

Halifax Regional Council
May 14, 2002

TO: Mayor Kelly and Members of Halifax Regional Council

SUBMITTED BY: 

Karen MacTavish, Director, Parks and Recreation

DATE: May 1, 2002

SUBJECT: Parks and Open Spaces Grass Contract Annual Evaluation

INFORMATION REPORT

ORIGIN

Regional Council awarded ten grass contracts in the 2001 season with an option for a renewal for an additional two years based on an annual evaluation by staff.

BACKGROUND

Beginning in 1999 outside grass contractors were employed as a cost effective way to provide basic lawn and bed maintenance in HRM's parks and open spaces. In 2001 the existing two year grass contracts were completed and HRM was required to re-tender the work. As part of the re-tender Parks and Open Spaces changed its grass contract from frequency based to performance based and tightened up its specifications and reporting system.

DISCUSSION

In February of 2002 Parks and Open Spaces, with the aid of a consultant, developed and carried out an evaluation of the ten HRM grass and planting bed contracts awarded for the 2001 season. The evaluation was three fold:

- 1) evaluate the administration of the grass contracts;
- 2) evaluate the performance of each one of the contractors involved in the grass contracts and make a recommendation of re-award; and
- 3) make recommendations for improvement to the grass contracting system.

In regards to the recommendations regarding HRM's grass contracting system the major recommendations centered around accurate and proper *Measurement*, adjusting *Service Levels* to achieve the desired result (especially as they pertain to shrub and flower beds), the necessity for clarity and accuracy in *Start-up Meetings* and the essential need for a *Contractor Reporting System*. While other recommendations were made, many of the issues encountered in the spring of 2001 can be traced to these areas. All of the recommendations intended for this coming season have been put in place including a mid-season evaluation of contractors and contract administration as suggested by Council. Staff have been given refresher training on the administration of these contracts, and Purchasing and Human Resources are preparing a course on general contract administration which all park supervisors will take.

The results of the contractor evaluation for the 2001 season found that three contracts were marginal. Staff has exercised its option not to renew one of the contracts and has re-tendered the work. All other contracts have been renewed and all contractors have been met with and given a detailed explanation of their individual evaluations. Particular emphasis was placed on the other two marginal contracts in terms of past performance, issues to be corrected, and expectations for the coming season.

Three of the four contractors involved with HRM have started their spring clean-up two weeks early at no additional cost to the municipality. This is in an effort to limit themselves from falling behind as the grass starts to grow all at once. It generally takes two mowings at the beginning of the season to establish the annual grass mowing cycles.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

The existing grass contracts are within budgeted amounts for 2002/03 fiscal year

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A: Grass Contractor Evaluation Form

Additional copies of this report, and information on its status, can be obtained by contacting the Office of the Municipal Clerk at 490-4210, or Fax 490-4208.

Report Prepared by: Peter Bigelow, General Manager, Parks and Open Spaces

Appendix A
Evaluation Template

Contractor Evaluation Template
 Grass Moving / Landscape Maintenance - Contracts
 Tender Number - Contractor -
 Supervisor -
 # of supervisor reports filed - # of contractor reports received -

<u>Areas To Be Included In The Annual Review Process</u>	Pass	Fail	Marginal	Reference In Technical Specification
<p>1 Damage To HRM Trees</p> <p>Incidents of moderate to serious damage to trees and or tree trunks caused by the contractor. If there was moderate to severe damage, please include a copy of the incident report. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Source: Supervisor reports Criteria: # of incidents Severity of incidents</p> <p>Rating: Pass No incidents of any sort 10 points Marginal Occasional Minor damage 4 – 7 points Fail any incidence of severe damage 0 points <i>Or</i> continued minor damage without remediation as long as communication of the issue to the contractor was documented</p>				3. (B)
<p>2 Workplace Safety</p> <p>In general, the contractor met the required Performance Standards and Service Levels for maintaining workplace safety. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Source: Supervisor reports Criteria: Documented Supervisor comments (section 4)</p> <p>Source: Contractor reports Criteria: Reported damage or insurance claims</p> <p>Rating: Pass No shut downs 7 - 10 points Full or substantially full compliance No property loss or insce claims Marginal Continued but not full compliance 4 – 7 points <i>Or</i> 1 shut down Fail more than 1 shut down 0 points <i>Or</i> continued violations without remediation as long as communication of the issue to the contractor was documented <i>Or</i> Department of Labour Citation</p>				5. (A - M)

3 Customer Service

In general, the contractor met the required Performance Standards and Service Levels for customer service. Yes No

Source: Supervisor reports

Criteria: # of complaints
of repeats

Source: Contractor reports

Criteria: # of complaints
Verified compliance with 48 hour response requirement

Rating: **Pass** No complaints 7 - 10 points

Or Few complaints handled in a timely manner

Marginal Any reported incidence of inappropriate interaction with customers 4 - 6 points

Or Some complaints on a continued basis

Or Significant complaints in the early part of the season showing improvement over the season

Fail Continued repeat complaints without remediation as long as communication of the issue to the contractor was documented 0 - 3 points

Or Repeated violations of the 48 hour response time requirement without remediation as long as communication of the issue to the contractor was documented

Or Repeated incidence of inappropriate interaction with customers without remediation as long as communication of the issue to the contractor was documented

6.

4 Communication

In general, the contractor met the required Performance Standards and Service Levels for communication. Yes No

Source: Scheduled Meeting notes

Criteria: Documented observations

Source: Supervisor reports

Criteria: Documented observations
Documented response to issues

Rating: **Pass** Contractor accessible and responsive 7 - 10 points

Marginal Contractor not always accessible 4 - 6 points

Or Contractor not always responsive

7. (A - C)

<p>Fail Failure to attend mandated meetings 0 – 3 points <i>Or</i> Failure to resolve complaints about accessibility or responsiveness</p>				
<p>5 Reporting In general, the contractor met the required Performance Standards and Service Levels for reporting. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Source: Supervisor reports (performance checklists) Criteria: Observations</p> <p>Source: Contractor reports Criteria: Veracity of contractor reports Completeness of contractor reports Timeliness of submission of contractor reports</p> <p>Rating: Pass All reports complete, accurate and provided on a timely basis 10 points Marginal Most reports complete, accurate and provided on a timely basis 4 - 6 points Fail Any false reports 0 points <i>Or</i> Repeated noncompliance with the reporting requirement without remediation as long as communication of the issue to the contractor was documented</p>				8.
<p>6 Grass Mowing Were areas policed for litter before mowing (no shredded litter present): Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Was height of turf keeping within required Service Levels: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Was quality of cut acceptable: (no scalping or other damage / uniform cut / etc.) Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Was trimming complete and acceptable and meeting required Service Levels: (including no damage to tree trunks*) Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Were grass clippings properly cleaned up and removed: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Where applicable were hard surfaces properly swept: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Where applicable, (High and Medium - Service Levels) was edging completed and to required Service Levels: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>In general, the contractor met the required Performance Standards and Service Levels for grass mowing. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>				Attachment I
<p>7 Spring Clean Up Were spring clean ups completed before the first mowing of the season: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Clean up of all areas complete and meeting required Service Levels: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>				Attachment I

<p>Hauling and disposal of all debris complete and meeting required Service Levels: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>In general, the sites / locations were maintained to the required Performance Standards and Service Levels for spring clean up. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
<p>8 Flower / Annual Bed Maintenance</p> <p>Has spring clean up of bed been completed: (applies to shrub beds only) Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Is cultivating and weeding being performed and meeting required Service Levels: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Is edging and perimeter trimming of beds and / or individual shrubs being performed and meeting required Service Levels: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Is hauling and removal of all material and debris (including any clippings deposited within beds) being performed and meeting required Service Levels: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Is hauling and removal of all material and debris (including any clippings deposited within beds) being performed and meeting required Service Levels: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>In general, the contractor met the required Performance Standards and Service Levels. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>				Attachment I
<p>9 Litter Barrels</p> <p>Were the litter barrels / baskets during grass mowing visits. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Is garbage / trash being removed off site and meeting required Service Levels: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>In general, the site / location was maintained to the required Performance Standards and Service Levels. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>				Attachment III
<p>10 Fall Clean Up Leaf Pick Up</p> <p>Was fall clean up / leaf pick up completed after the last mowing of the season: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Clean up of all areas complete and meeting required Service Levels: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Has the hauling and disposal of all debris been completed and meeting required Service Levels: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>				Attachment III
<p>11 Sport Field / Ball Field Grass Cutting</p> <p>Were areas policed for litter before mowing (no shredded litter present) Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Was height of turf kept to required Service Level for the applicable HRM Athletic Facility Classification: (ie. Sport Field / Ball Diamond) Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Was quality of cut acceptable: (no scalping or other damage / uniform cut / etc.) Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Was trimming complete and acceptable and meeting required Service Levels (including no damage to tree trunks*) Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>				Attachment III

Were grass clippings been properly cleaned up and removed: Yes No

Were all hard surfaces been properly swept (including warning tracks): Yes No

In general, the contractor met the required Performance Standards and and Service Levels. Yes No

For Sections 6 - 11

Source: Supervisor reports (performance checklists)

Criteria: Responses to Section 1

Source: Drop inspections

Criteria: Documented appearance

Source: Correspondence, calls and photographs

Criteria: Documented observations

Rating: **Pass** Substantially all requirements completed on a timely basis 7 - 10 points

Marginal Most requirements completed on a timely basis 4 - 6 points

Or Some inadequacies but corrections performed on a timely basis

Or Some inadequacies in the early part of the season showing improvement over the season

Fail Did not meet the standards on a regular basis 0 - 3 points

Or Continually failed to meet standards without remediation as long as communication of the issue to the contractor is documented

Recommendation

Renew this contract with vendor for the second season Yes No

Comments:

Completed by:

Date: