

Proposer Name: Health Fitness

Evaluator Name: Sally Robinson

Selection Review Committee RFP Evaluation Form

Recreational and Aquatic Center Operations and Management Services

190-18^t

Instructions: Each member of the Selection Review Committee will provide two evaluations for each proposal:

1. An evaluation of the written proposal.
2. An evaluation of the interview (if applicable).

Each evaluation will be made based on the following scoring criteria:

	TOTAL POINTS	100
Criteria		Maximum Score
Introductory Letter (not scored, but considered)		--
Overall Experience		30
Proposed Programming/Operational Plan		30
References		15
Budget/Financial Proposal		25
	TOTAL POINTS	100

After the interview evaluation process has been completed, determination of the successful proposer will be based on **both** the interview evaluation and the written proposal evaluation.

Written Proposal Evaluation

Criteria	Notes	Max Points	My Score
Overall Experience	see notes	30	30
Proposed Programming / Operational Plan	↓	30	30
References		15	15
Budget/Financial Proposal		25	20
Total:		100	95

Note: This form is subject to Oregon Public Records Law

Interview Evaluation

Criteria	Notes	Max Points	My Score
Overall Experience	see notes	30	30
Proposed Programming / Operational Plan	↓	30	30
References		15	15
Budget/Financial Proposal		25	20
Total:		100	95

Note: This form is subject to Oregon Public Records Law

+95
190

Proposer Name: THPRD

Evaluator Name: Sally Robinson

Selection Review Committee RFP Evaluation Form

Recreational and Aquatic Center Operations and Management Services

122-2nd

Instructions: Each member of the Selection Review Committee will provide two evaluations for each proposal:

1. An evaluation of the written proposal.
2. An evaluation of the interview (if applicable).

Each evaluation will be made based on the following scoring criteria:

	TOTAL POINTS	100
Criteria		Maximum Score
Introductory Letter (not scored, but considered)		--
Overall Experience		30
Proposed Programming/Operational Plan		30
References		15
Budget/Financial Proposal		25
	TOTAL POINTS	100

After the interview evaluation process has been completed, determination of the successful proposer will be based on **both** the interview evaluation and the written proposal evaluation.

Written Proposal Evaluation

Criteria	Notes	Max Points	My Score
Overall Experience	see notes	30	25
Proposed Programming / Operational Plan	↓	30	25
References		15	0
Budget/Financial Proposal		25	20
Total:		100	70

Note: This form is subject to Oregon Public Records Law

Interview Evaluation

Criteria	Notes	Max Points	My Score
Overall Experience	See notes	30	17
Proposed Programming / Operational Plan	↓	30	25
References		15	0
Budget/Financial Proposal		25	10
Total:		100	52

Note: This form is subject to Oregon Public Records Law

+70
52
 122

Proposer Name: YMCA
 Evaluator Name: Sally Robinson

Selection Review Committee RFP Evaluation Form

Recreational and Aquatic Center Operations and Management Services

Instructions: Each member of the Selection Review Committee will provide two evaluations for each proposal:

1. An evaluation of the written proposal.
2. An evaluation of the interview (if applicable).

101 + 3rd

Each evaluation will be made based on the following scoring criteria:

	TOTAL POINTS	100
Criteria	Maximum Score	
Introductory Letter (not scored, but considered)		--
Overall Experience		30
Proposed Programming/Operational Plan		30
References		15
Budget/Financial Proposal		25
	TOTAL POINTS	100

After the interview evaluation process has been completed, determination of the successful proposer will be based on **both** the interview evaluation and the written proposal evaluation.

Written Proposal Evaluation

Criteria	Notes	Max Points	My Score
Overall Experience	See notes	30	17
Proposed Programming / Operational Plan	↓	30	15
References	↓	15	5
Budget/Financial Proposal		25	22
Total:		100	59

Note: This form is subject to Oregon Public Records Law

Interview Evaluation

Criteria	Notes	Max Points	My Score
Overall Experience	see notes	30	12
Proposed Programming / Operational Plan	↓	30	15
References		15	0
Budget/Financial Proposal		25	15
Total:		100	42

+59
101

Note: This form is subject to Oregon Public Records Law

Proposer Name: United Pools
 Evaluator Name: Sally Robinson

Selection Review Committee RFP Evaluation Form
Recreational and Aquatic Center Operations and Management Services

4th (27)

Instructions: Each member of the Selection Review Committee will provide two evaluations for each proposal:

1. An evaluation of the written proposal.
2. An evaluation of the interview (if applicable).

Each evaluation will be made based on the following scoring criteria:

	TOTAL POINTS	100
Criteria		Maximum Score
Introductory Letter (not scored, but considered)		--
Overall Experience		30
Proposed Programming/Operational Plan		30
References		15
Budget/Financial Proposal		25
	TOTAL POINTS	100

After the interview evaluation process has been completed, determination of the successful proposer will be based on **both** the interview evaluation and the written proposal evaluation.

Written Proposal Evaluation

Criteria	Notes	Max Points	My Score
Overall Experience	see notes	30	12
Proposed Programming / Operational Plan	↓	30	10
References		15	0
Budget/Financial Proposal		25	5
Total:		100	27

Note: This form is subject to Oregon Public Records Law

Interview Evaluation

Criteria	Notes	Max Points	My Score
Overall Experience	N/A	30	0
Proposed Programming / Operational Plan	↓	30	0
References		15	0
Budget/Financial Proposal		25	0
Total:		100	0

+ 27

27

Note: This form is subject to Oregon Public Records Law

Proposer Name: SFM/CHO
 Evaluator Name: Sally Robinson

Selection Review Committee RFP Evaluation Form

Recreational and Aquatic Center Operations and Management Services

Instructions: Each member of the Selection Review Committee will provide two evaluations for each proposal:

1. An evaluation of the written proposal.
2. An evaluation of the interview (if applicable).

(22) - 5th

Each evaluation will be made based on the following scoring criteria:

	TOTAL POINTS	100
Criteria	Maximum Score	
Introductory Letter (not scored, but considered)	--	
Overall Experience	30	
Proposed Programming/Operational Plan	30	
References	15	
Budget/Financial Proposal	25	
	TOTAL POINTS	100

After the interview evaluation process has been completed, determination of the successful proposer will be based on **both** the interview evaluation and the written proposal evaluation.

Written Proposal Evaluation

Criteria	Notes	Max Points	My Score
Overall Experience	see notes	30	10
Proposed Programming / Operational Plan	↓	30	2
References		15	5
Budget/Financial Proposal		25	5
Total:		100	22

Note: This form is subject to Oregon Public Records Law

Interview Evaluation

Criteria	Notes	Max Points	My Score
Overall Experience	N/A	30	—
Proposed Programming / Operational Plan	↓	30	—
References	✓	15	—
Budget/Financial Proposal		25	—
Total:		100	0

Note: This form is subject to Oregon Public Records Law

RFP Proposer Scores: (in order of ranking)

1. Health Fitness

- a. **Intro Letter** – Perfect length letter, summarizing succinctly why City of Sherwood should pick Health Fitness. Most impressive of all proposers.
- b. **Written Proposal:** Most comprehensive of all proposers. Repeats each requirement in the RFP and directly answers/responds to each—meeting our format rather than their own format (as in SFM & United Pools).
 - (1) **Experience:** In business for 42 yrs., present in 37 states in US; prides self as understanding the unique local environment & culture, key values & objectives of each client.
 - (2) **Programming/Operational Plan:** Intends to use tenured transition team using an efficient transition action plan with proven experience (even provides draft plan). Process includes PVA (program value analysis) using unbiased consultative approach. Will provide 1) Summary Document & 2) Draft Operating Plan to start transition/plan. Will set up advisory committee; has set scheduled planning/review meetings. Has extensive marketing & communication plan model, & provides sample marketing campaigns. Note that marketing materials have City's logo on them, as desired. Offers City opportunity to weigh in on final hires. Really like Program Calendar for Sherwood, many ideas from corporate.
 - (3) **References:** Provides both summary of reference clients & details for each, noting similarities with Sherwood's facility.
 - (4) **Budget/Financial Proposal:** Proposes scholarship programs & funds needed for same. Confirms will keep current fees same in 1st yr. and future changes approved by City (vs. YMCA – they refuse that option).
- c. **Interview: Best team of interviewees by far** – very knowledgeable & exciting!! Tony Deacy (facilitator), Arch Hasler (22 yrs), James Aranowski (25 yrs & point of contact if selected) & Chip Boyd (16 yrs, from TX, 2nd point of contact) all flown out to present. Very impressed these guys have so many yrs with co.
 - (1) **Experience:** Have respectable tenured people; has experience in taking over facility from others x 4 (no one else even has 1) & they can handle it; can help improve our ability to decrease costs (good at tracking). No worries about facilitating transition with YMCA in

next year; in fact, happy to have a yr. to do so! Love their motto to grow healthy population through health & personalized path of wellness & fact they refer to City of Sherwood as “client”. Really researched our City mission & values to offer proposal. Looking to expand co. by acquiring 6-8 new accounts/clients per year.

- (2) Programming/Operational Plan: Like to be the quiet partner, promote healthy culture (similar to key values Y members say they won't get with someone else). Goal to have 8 visits per mo., marketing manager is on site. Pride themselves on “value added programs & services” to partnership with City. Will continue to offer SilverSneakers program (one of treasured programs per comments), intent to serve all of community. Fundraising intended to be included by HF under “Community Contributions/Gifts” line item in budget – included in the mgmt fees.
- (3) References: Gives 3 examples of other similar clients.
- (4) Budget/Financial Proposal: Like the HF like clients data – very closely tracks & rates even better with similar facilities. Annual management fee is \$192K—significantly less than YMCA & includes work with city re branding & marketing. Provides option for City consideration to have the General Manager to start 4 weeks early than rest of staff for extra fee (negotiated). Management fee is fixed & if profit, all to city. Projection during interview shows upward trend in the recovery rate—showing confidence that can make facility as profitable as possible. Will help with financial strategy for pool expansion. In follow up questions, provides a ProForma spreadsheet showing facility revenues exceeding expenses by year 5. In providing revised numbers, they feel confident there will be no impact to quality or quantity of services – and #s still conservative & can be met or exceeded. Also, emphasized their average annual recovery rate with like-clients is 112% & that will be their objective for Sherwood. Will bill City for monthly losses or refund overage monthly so to spread out risk of losses per follow up questions.

2. THPRD

- a. **Opening Letter** – Liked that key personnel were identified. Too short.
- b. **Written Proposal**: Much more organized & easier to read, except no tabs (would have helped).

- (1) Experience: Largest special park district in OR; in business of owning & operating recreation facilities since 1955. Like the Mission Statement (pg.4). Wealth of knowledge in operating facilities. Much better/more professional resumes of key personnel including Doug Menke (general manager)(Doc 2). Large # of Organizational Overviews of many departments.
- (2) Proposed Programming/Operational Plan: Offer quality sports & rec facilities & programs for residents & workers of all ages, cultural backgrounds, abilities & income levels. Will be managed with same framework & updated “Programs Functional Plan”—a very impressive (attached) evolving guide for development & delivery of programs services. (pg. 5) Day-to-day operation of the facility to be filled with a FT Center Supervisor that reports to Superintendent of Recreation at district offices. Like annual goals reviewed quarterly (pg. 6), reporting also to Kristen. Will use Conestoga Rec & Aquatic Ctr as model for Sherwood facility. Marketing to be managed by Marketing Specialist & through an impressive Marketing Plan (which is also attached as Doc 17), with facets of information not used currently. Will brand to Sherwood targeted audience with wide range of marketing channels. Like the focus on customer acquisition & retention goals, with hierarchy of campaigns (pg. 7). Staffing recruitment done through NEOGOV. Has defined hiring Guidelines for personnel. Like possibility of THRIVE afterschool programming. Also participates in SilverSneakers & SilerFit.
- (3) References: Didn’t see any, except that they will use Conestoga as model for Sherwood’s operational performance.
- (4) Budget/Financial Proposal: Interesting “center overhead” is only ~ \$60K”. Curious that they don’t project same revenues. Goal to create balanced cost recovery model that identifies & establishes financial accountability & sustainability goals, while supporting core values, vision, & mission of district & community (pg. 13). Needs will grow & evolve. First year start-up costs significant, but expected. Has scholarship program (pg. 14) & free child care, if selected (different memberships)(pg. 15). Lower cost for swimming lessons! Disadvantage is City to reimburse for any losses. Proposes to have annual replacement reserve with significant one-time unfunded reserve balance.

- c. **Interview:** 3 persons provided a short presentation from THPRD – Deb Schoen, Aisha Panas (who was a very articulate, great speaker) & Keith Hobson.
- (1) **Experience:** Though they haven't had any experience taking over a facility, they have mastered experience to operate recreation facilities in the field.
 - (2) **Programming/Operational Plan:** Will keep same programming schedule as is currently used. They utilize a Park Foundation for fundraising, but can't do in Sherwood—though have come up with an alternative group for Sherwood. They can accommodate 2-tiered structure Sherwood has, a friends group & an advisory committee. The Center Operator will be a staff person transferred in to manage Sherwood facility to minimize any learning curve that incorporates structure of THPRD. They have done lots of, and are open to do in Sherwood, a summer concert series, theater in the Park, etc. Their THRIVE program is for 1st through Jr. High students, could also offer to High school students too (at Teen Center). Explained that Sherwood would be a stand-alone facility from other THPRD facilities.
 - (3) **References:** Not discussed.
 - (4) **Budget/Finances:** The District budget is \$100 million, consisting of \$30 million in property taxes & \$12 mill. in program fees. The similar to Sherwood facility, Conastoga, had a 2008 bond for expansion. Could not explain (“no good answers”) for the increasing operating/capital net losses over the 5-year projection – will have to look at that later (in contract negotiation). When asked why they are asking to share in profits, but the City only to absorb losses, they stated that would be something we could discuss in contract negotiations. They want a Park Foundation to fund scholarships. Finances propose a 5-year replacement plan. Will have to increase membership fees.

3. YMCA

- a. **Intro Letter** – Undated; extensive puffery of the Y; letter too long. Not sincere, reference to religious principles – could have been stated as such without reference to “Christian” since we are governmental agency. Reliance on feasibility study overstated, not impactful. More focus should have been on Sherwood facility since they've been operating it for 20 yrs. Maybe this is because YMCACW doesn't have understanding of Sherwood facility with Renee Brouse gone (former Executive Director (ED)).
- b. **Written Proposal:** YMCACW determined some info. is confidential or proprietary – concerned they may be hiding something.

(1) Experience: Reference to 149 yrs (really?) serving Portland – not focused on Sherwood facility, but like the fact that company is non-profit. “Combined experience of 3 directors” not really what looking for, would have been nice to know their individual contributions in Sherwood. Key point: Missing an ED. [Note: Mark Burris told me months ago they were going to replace ED within a month, but never happened.] Board of Managers – importantly missing hidden fact: not many left on board, can’t keep quorum? Says they review financial statements are reviewed at each meeting (are there 20 yrs worth of statements?). Haven’t seen any recent volunteer or fundraising or presence in the community recently (one of the functions of BOM). Resumes of key people = interesting that Mark Burris’ one is deficient of any “accomplishments” or actual responsibilities for Sherwood facility that he has done since July 2016 when he came on board, but Bob Hall’s one is nothing but “accomplishments” which have nothing to do with Sherwood, showing how little Sherwood is to the overall YMCA organization. I would have expected much better detail of existing staff since they’re been running the show for 20 yrs.

(2) Proposed Programming/Operational Plan: Will leverage corporate & national YMCA to market Sherwood facility—so does that mean that City of Sherwood logo would not be included? It is missing from Exh. 12, and only lists YMCA. Staffing proposed says “strong workplace culture” but later learned of serious staff concerns (YMCA won’t disclose survey requests). “Operating surpluses will be retained in the Sherwood Y” is BIG plus, however, don’t trust financials. Proposal says “all terms & conditions subject to Board of Trustee’s approval” (but that’s not what Bob Hall said in interview). Concern that there’s only 2 other Oregon YMCA facilities left (pg. 11), why is that? Big plus is swim team practice & competitions (pg. 12), even though they are inadequate & need expansion desperately. No real collaboration with City in proposal, but Bob Hall keeps referencing a “partnership”. Like the free Child Watch program, scholarships/financial assistance. Real concern: Fee schedule (Exh. 23) shows YMCA raised rates in May 2017—right before this proposal, and that paying members consist of only 68% of Sherwood residents vs. 32% of non-residents. Don’t disclose that the YMCA gets reimbursed by SilverSneakers programs by insurance companies.

(3) References. Nothing stands out. However, do know they leased out YMCA in Sherwood without coordinating with the City or giving any funds to City (violates contract).

(4) Budget/Finances: Proposal is misleading & untruthful—claims no management fee (pg. 30), but their proposal (pg. 24) shows a fee of \$328,718 this year and \$347,396 proposed for next year (the highest of all proposers). Concern that “management services allocation from Sherwood Y 11% of branch revenue.”

Why are they pushing so hard when we are only 10% of overall revenue of the YMCACW? (per Mark Burris). Suspicious of written financial proposal—current year \$328,718 is “management support services” & continues to go up for proposed 5 yr period to a max of \$327,045!! How are they then able to provide services without a deficit? Something is missing. Includes over \$600,000 in depreciation to arrive at “net proceeds” for YMCACW, and profits before deducting depreciation for next 3 yrs. (Exh. 11)

c. Interview:

(1) Experience. Mark Burris (not a good public speaker), Bob Hall (who didn't say much) and 2 others presented. No enthusiasm in presentation – which is surprising for top leaders. Felt presentation (and subsequent remarks by members) was/were not genuine because they claim their proposal is the ONLY choice (“it’s a no brainer”, “we are the only ones.....”)(which they do have advantage of experience in operating the facility), that the public has spoken, etc. Interviewed representatives continued references to “partnership” with Sherwood, despite past problems with “partnership” in trying to negotiate contract. Surprised that speakers not able to answer all questions at interview, despite operating facility for 20 yrs., though they claimed they were more than willing to answer additional questions (& didn't timely respond to additional questions). MB disclosed later there are only 11 BOM at Sherwood facility, when supposed to be ~ 20, sometimes can't meet quorum and not enough want to meet in summer. Several BOM members have left because of politics & for fear of speaking out. Why should we trust them if there's a lack of concern at BOM level?

(2) Programming/Operational Plan: When asked how will things improve, how will it get better in light of past failed negotiations, Bob Hall continues to refer to “partnering” with the City. Not interested in a partner, just want an operator. Some YMCA members report that facility is rundown, dirty & in state of disrepair, while others say it is perfect. Some members state programming isn't conducive to families who wish to take evening classes—thus not meeting the needs of a large part of our residents. Hard to reconcile truth with such stark differences. No visible security measures in place. Concern over church & state with confirmed references to “Christian” up in facility & mentioned

few times. Interview question on this topic met with their standard “inclusion to all” reference, but only when MB toured the facility did he know 4 signs were up that might deter other faiths. Interviewees not aware of YMCA’s explanation to members years ago re raising rates in order to fund expansion of the pool. Follow up questions to the YMCA revealed decreasing staff last year (9 FTE at end of year vs. 11 during the year), consistent with concerns over staffing. Staff costs at YMCA lower than other 2 finalists, which is likely how their financials are claimed better. Burriss & Hall take 7 paragraphs to answer question on below market salaries, which again circles back to their “argument” that they are the only ones to fund losses. Claims “excitement” to work more closely with the City “to strengthen our partnership” if a possible 9-member commission/board is utilized [in lieu of BOM], with a caveat that they want the BOM to stay in place. This has caused great divide in our community lately. Handout by YMCA says area of focus is on “giving back & providing support for our neighbors” but that’s only if you are a Y member or pay \$\$ to participate in their programs.

- (3) References: Offered to share local executive directors of other facilities, but would have liked to have heard from prior ED. Heard through some employees that staff morale is low, and this appears to be true with the Y’s refusal to share staff study. If they are so proud of their staff, why not share it? Suspicious.
- (4) Budget/Financials: Still cannot reconcile the finances. Burriss admits that the “management services” is a fee. Costs seem high in light of fact that revenue is only 10% of YMCACW – maybe expenses merely listed as percentage rather than actuals? Proposal not to include expansion of pool – that is city’s responsibility, but they agree it is needed. One member said kids got sick while in the pool, so they discontinued membership. VERY misleading flyer sent out by Mark Burriss on “postcard” to Sherwood residents (which was very improper, political & certainly inflamed the residents along with the “Keep the Y” campaign) seeking to have residents tell council what to do. Not happy with Mark Burriss/YMCA sending this out.

United Pools

- b. **Opening Letter** – Didn’t see any.
c. **Written Proposal**:

- (1) Experience: Launched the pool management concept in 1979; has actively participated in the Association of Pool & Spa Professionals (APSP), National Swimming Pool Foundation (NSPF), American Red Cross (ARC), National Recreation & Parks Association (NRPA); committed to providing the most comprehensive management services program in the industry; has experience in 28 states. Has managed recreation & aquatic facilities across the country, including management of operations, aquatic & fitness programming, concessions, lifeguard training and staffing & pro shops. Identifies President Sean Legg as the point person for the company.
- (2) Programming/Operational Plan: Program based on 3 key principles: Safety, Participation & Fiscal Responsibility. Will do extensive research from the start in the Sherwood area to identify what is currently available to the residents & determine the type of program package that will fill the needs that aren't currently being met and start offering a higher level of service to clients that already have a choice on where they can receive programs such as swim lessons, water aerobics, or parties and events.
- (3) References: None
- (4) Budget/Financial Proposal: Proposes a Cost Plus and Fixed Fee type proposal without any financials. Has had great success with local governments across the country because they understand the dynamics of the budget process & limits on taxpayer money to fund these types of operations. On average, claim to save our facilities 20% to 30% annually. Management fee is cost plus fixed fee.

d. **Interview**: N/A.

5. The Sports Facilities Management LLC (SFM) & Counsilman-Hunsaker (CHO):

- a. **Opening Letter** – SFM's facility operating and programming expertise, coupled with CHO's aquatic specific knowledge will meet and exceed the needs and expectations of Sherwood. Eric Sullivan to be the point of contact.
- b. **Written Proposal**:
 - i. Experience: The Sports Facilities Advisory (SFA) was founded in 2003, while Counsilman-Hunsaker was founded in 1970. Promises to focus on the safety, service, and success of our aquatic facility.

- ii. Programming/Operational Plan: References the City of Sherwood as the “client” (big plus).
 - iii. References: Offers 7 names of references for management history, plus “summaries” of projects as references.
 - iv. Budget/Financial Proposal: Under SFM, our facility will undergo a rigorous monthly "Budget Versus Actual" (variance) review. Budget process to include 1) Initial budget process; 2) annual operations budget; 3) emergency expenditures; 4) capital expenditures budget.
Management fee \$276,000 plus travel costs not to exceed \$24K.
- c. **Interview** – N/A.