

**EVALUATION MEMORANDUM
Solicitation Number RFP #19-027
Hammond Gymnastics Center Management**

A. INTRODUCTION

The City of Sandy Springs (“City”) issued a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) for Hammond Gymnastics Center Management - RFP #19-027 on February 6, 2019. The City solicited proposals from highly qualified vendors to provide all services required to provide management and other services needed for a turnkey operation for the Hammond Gymnastics Center located at 705 Hammond Road, Sandy Springs, Georgia 30328 (“Project”). Facilities at the Hammond Center include two (2) gymnasiums, both equipped for gymnastics programming, a multi-purpose room, two (2) offices and public restrooms. The vendor selected for contract award will be managed and directed by the City’s Recreation and Parks Department.

The City’s objective in seeking qualified vendors for management services was to increase capacity and utilization of the gyms and multi-purpose room for programming and rentals. Improved awareness of the benefits of programs and services offered and long term sustainability of offerings at the Center were key components. The primary use of the facility will remain developing youth gymnasts and supplemental programming in fitness and health instruction. The contract for these services will replace what has been historically managed by the City.

The decision to outsource management services was necessitated by the downward trend in gymnastics participation numbers over the last three (3) years. A snapshot comparison of overall individual registration in FY17 and FY18 revealed an 18% decline or loss of 801 seasonal registrants. Recreational gymnastics declined by 17% or 603 registrants. Team gymnastics showed a loss of 27%. Gymnastics camps over this period declined by 71% or 117. Revenue loss is associated with these trends which continues into FY19.

The awarded vendor will assume responsibility for planning and conducting all activities and programs. Class instruction, staff supervision, program registration, janitorial, and security are requirements. Preschool, recreational, and team gymnastics are significant program options with martial arts program rentals and birthday parties an important revenue source. Phoenix will offer pricing similar to existing City fees for classes, clinics, and camps.

B. EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Responses to the RFP (“Proposals”) were evaluated by individuals selected by the City Manager (“Evaluation Committee”) using the criteria set forth in the RFP. Members of the Evaluation Committee were:

- Michael Perry, Director, Sandy Springs Recreation and Parks Department
- Steve Ciaccio, Deputy Director, Recreation and Parks Department
- Erika Sherman, Administrative Assistant, Recreation and Parks Department

In addition, the following advisors assisted the Evaluation Committee with expertise in areas critical to the success of the Project:

- Charise Glass, Purchasing Manager, Sandy Springs Finance Department
- Dezirae Gaines, Senior Contract Specialist, Sandy Springs Finance Department

C. RFP

General: The RFP was released on February 6, 2019. Questions were due from contractors submitting Proposals (“Offerors”) no later than March 29, 2019, 5:00 p.m. To ensure maximum outreach and competition, the City advertised the RFP on the City’s website, Bonfire, and on the Georgia Procurement Registry. Nineteen (19) metro area gyms were solicited directly. Only two (2) submittals were received.

The Purchasing Department conducted an initial review of each Proposal received for administrative compliance. No administrative compliance issues were noted.

In the RFP, the City requested Offerors to submit information to permit a comprehensive evaluation of the Offeror’s Proposal. The information solicited should demonstrate the Offeror’s competence and capability to successfully complete the requirements specified in the scope of services described in the RFP. The RFP described in detail the information to be contained in the Proposal, including: an executive summary; a business plan; past performance/key personnel information; a cost/fee proposal; a phase-in plan; and a model contract. Generally, the Proposal should:

1. Demonstrate the Offeror’s understanding of the general requirements of the RFP and contract requirements;
2. Convey the Offeror’s capabilities for transforming understanding of the requirements into accomplishment;
3. Provide in detail the Offeror’s plans and methods for so doing; and
4. Provide the cost/price associated with so doing.

D. EVALUATION

General: Pursuant to provisions of the RFP and consistent with the criteria stated therein, Proposals were evaluated as follows:

Proposals were scored and ranked based on the Offeror’s ability to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of four (4) evaluation criteria:

1. Past performance/key personnel;
2. Business plan;

3. Cost/fee Proposal; and
4. Phase-in plan.

A Proposal could score a possible maximum of one hundred (100) points. The required elements of discussion for the evaluation criteria and the possible maximum individual scores were:

1. Past Performance/Key Personnel (45% or 45 points total)
2. Business Plan (35% or 35 points total)
2. Cost/Fee Proposal (10% or 10 points total)
4. Phase-In Template (10% or 10 points total)
5. Model Contract (The Offeror's data entered in the Model Contract was reviewed for accuracy and completeness)

Responses to RFP: On April 19, 2019, the City received two (2) Proposals from the following Offerors:

- Phoenix Gymnastics, LLC (“Phoenix”)
- Elite Talent Academy (“Elite”)

The Evaluation Committee reviewed both Proposals, completed its evaluations and reported its findings to the Purchasing Department. Based on the Evaluation Committee's findings, it was determined that both Offerors had a reasonable expectation of receiving a contract award; therefore, both were moved forward for further consideration to make presentations.

Formal Interviews and Presentations: The Evaluation Committee invited both Offerors to make presentations on 4/30/ 2019.

Each Offeror provided a brief overview of the company and prior relevant experience examples and responded to questions from the Evaluation Committee. Each Offeror had forty-five (45) minutes to present its Proposal and respond to the questions posed by the Evaluation Committee. Following interviews, the Evaluation Committee discussed the pros and cons of each presentation against stated criteria. While both presentations were impressive, the presentation by Phoenix was ranked best by the Evaluation Committee.

Phoenix was selected for its commitment to improving local participation in programming. It demonstrated a more robust daytime program schedule model and strength in recreational gymnastics program development that will better guarantee continuity in participation over time. Phoenix also demonstrated an understanding of the City's interest and the community's need for providing scholarships to the underrepresented. It offered to provide supplemental programs to create a fund for gymnast families and sustain the scholarship beyond the City's single season supplement up to a year. The pre-school gymnastics element of Phoenix's offerings elsewhere known as *Kids Gym USA*, will be led by a staff with thirty-three (33) years of experience. *Kids Gym USA* also provides after-school programming expertise.

Cost/Fee Results: Phoenix also presented the cost/fee Proposal that was most advantageous to the City. The City will receive \$33,500 per year in the first year. In years two (2) thru five (5), the City will receive \$90,000 per year. Minimum expected totals projected by Phoenix over five (5) years is

\$393,500. The City will contribute \$10,000 annually for the purpose of replacing worn or dated gymnastics equipment. By contrast, Elite proposed a \$63,000 return to the City in years one (1) through five (5). Elite's minimum expected total for five (5) years is \$315,000, which is a \$78,500 lesser projected return to the City than that of Phoenix.

Reference Findings: References were contacted for Phoenix and were positive.

E. FINAL RECOMMENDATION

Based on the assessment of Proposals as described herein, the Evaluation Committee recommends contract award to Phoenix, as that Proposal represents the best value for the City.

Respectfully submitted by the following members of the Evaluation Committee:

Mike Perry
Director, Sandy Springs Recreation and Parks Department

Steve Ciaccio
Deputy Director, Sandy Springs Recreation and Parks Department

Erika Sherman
Administrative Assistant, Sandy Springs Recreation and Parks Department