

Corporation of the Township of Chisholm

Municipal Office/Council Chambers: 2847 Chiswick Line, Powassan, Ont. P0H 1Z0

Phone (705) 724-3526 - Fax (705) 724-5099 info@chisholm.ca

ADDITION TO AGENDA COUNCIL MEETING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2026 7:00 PM

11. NEW BUSINESS

- (e) RFP 2026-01 Integrity Commissioner submission evaluation summary (Encl.)

RFP 2026-01 – Integrity Commissioner

Evaluation Summary & Recommendation to Council

The Township received compliant submissions from the following proponents:

1. **Boghosian + Allen LLP** (David G. Boghosian)
2. **ADR Chambers Inc.** (Proposed IC: Daniela Corapi; Associate: Ellen Fry)
3. **Hines Law** (Rebecca Hines)
4. **Probity Municipal Consulting** (Chris Wray, AMCT)

All submissions met the mandatory requirements of the RFP and were evaluated using the criteria identified in the RFP, including:

- Demonstrated qualifications and experience
 - Understanding of the Integrity Commissioner role
 - Approach and methodology
 - Capacity and availability
 - Cost and value for money
 - Overall fit for a small, northern municipality
-

Evaluation Summary by Proponent

1) ADR Chambers Inc.

Strengths

- Extensive, province-wide Integrity Commissioner experience across municipalities and school boards.
- Strong institutional capacity, including dedicated administrative and legal support.
- Clear, well-structured investigative and advisory processes aligned with the Municipal Act.
- Backup investigator identified, reducing continuity risk.
- Demonstrated ability to meet statutory timelines consistently.

Considerations

- Highest overall cost (annual retainer plus highest hourly rate).
- Service model may exceed the scale and needs of a small municipality.

Overall Assessment

Highly qualified, low operational risk, but at a premium cost relative to Township size and anticipated workload.

2) Boghosian + Allen LLP

Strengths

- Exceptional depth of municipal law, litigation, and accountability experience.
- Widely recognized expertise in integrity, transparency, and governance.
- Extensive Integrity Commissioner appointments across Ontario.
- Strong credibility and defensibility in high-conflict or high-profile matters.

Considerations

- Higher hourly rate.
- Large-firm model may be more than is required for Chisholm's typical volume and complexity.

Overall Assessment

Extremely strong candidate from a technical and reputational standpoint; cost and scale may exceed practical needs.

3) Hines Law

Strengths

- Solid municipal Integrity Commissioner experience.
- Practical investigative and reporting background.
- Clear understanding of statutory authority and procedural fairness.
- Moderate hourly rate relative to large firms.

Considerations

- Sole-practitioner model with no formal backup identified.
- Less breadth of municipal client base compared to top-ranked proponents.

Overall Assessment

Capable and qualified option with reasonable cost, but less organizational depth and redundancy.

4) Probity Municipal Consulting

Strengths

- Lowest hourly rate and no retainer, providing strong value for money.
- Extensive senior municipal administrative experience, particularly in small, rural, and northern municipalities.
- Clear understanding of council–staff dynamics and practical governance realities.
- Proportionate, prevention-focused approach aligned with smaller-municipality needs.
- Flexible, as-required service model with limited administrative overhead.

Considerations

- Not a law firm; relies on applied municipal and administrative law expertise rather than litigation practice.
- Smaller organizational structure than national or provincial providers.

Overall Assessment

Strong alignment with the Township’s size, governance environment, anticipated workload, and fiscal context.

Comparative Ranking (Overall)

Rank Proponent		Summary Rationale
1	Probity Municipal Consulting	Best overall fit for a small, northern municipality; strong governance experience; lowest cost; proportionate service model
2	ADR Chambers Inc.	Highest institutional capacity and experience; higher cost
3	Boghosian + Allen LLP	Exceptional expertise; premium pricing and scale
4	Hines Law	Qualified and capable; limited depth and redundancy

Cost Comparison Table

The following table summarizes the pricing information submitted by each compliant proponent in response to RFP 2026-01 for Integrity Commissioner services. All amounts are exclusive of HST and applicable disbursements.

Proponent	Retainer	Hourly Rate(s)	Mileage
Probity Municipal Consulting	\$0	\$150/hr	\$0.70 per km (CRA rate)
Hines Law	\$0	\$330/hr	\$0.55 per km
Boghosian + Allen LLP	\$500	\$290/hr (Partner) \$250/hr (Junior Lawyer) \$150/hr (Law Clerk)	CRA mileage rates
ADR Chambers Inc.	\$2,500 / year	\$350/hr	\$0.72 per km

Recommendation to Council

That Council appoint Probity Municipal Consulting as Integrity Commissioner for the Township of Chisholm for the four-year term contemplated in RFP 2026-01, subject to execution of an agreement satisfactory to the Township.

Rationale:

- Demonstrates a strong understanding of the Integrity Commissioner role within the context of small and northern municipalities.
- Offers a cost-effective, flexible service model aligned with anticipated demand.
- Provides practical, proportionate governance support while meeting statutory requirements under the Municipal Act, 2001.
- Represents the best balance of experience, accessibility, and value for money.

In accordance with Section 5.4.3 of the Procurement By-law and the Municipal Act, 2001, Council retains full discretion to accept or reject any proposal, or to vary from the ranking, provided the decision is made in good faith, is procedurally fair, and is supported by a rational basis.

Prepared by: Lesley Marshall, CAO / Clerk-Treasurer

Date: February 09, 2026