CITY OF JOPLIN
EWERT POOL STUDY
PRELIMINARY OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE
4-Jun-20

| VENDOR NAME | SCORE | SCORE | SCORE | SCORE | SCORE | SCORE | TOTAL SCORE | OVERALL AVG SCORE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Waters Edge | 99 | 92 | 93 | 93 | 95 | 94 | 566 | 94.3 |
| RDG | 88 | 93 | 82 | 82 | 91 | 80 | 516 | 86.0 |
| Counsilman Hunsaker | 92 | 82 | 79 | 87 | 88 | 71 | 499 | 83.2 |
| Vireo Landscape Architecture | 85 | 82 | 70 | 79 | 68 | 76 | 460 | 76.7 |
| Confluence | 79 | 63 | 71 | 73 | 46 | 69 | 401 | 66.8 |
| SFS Architecture | 64 | 65 | 55 | 59 | 54 | 59 | 356 | 59.3 |

# SUMMARY OF PRELIMINARY COMMENTS FOR RFP ANALYSIS

# EWERT POOL STUDY

# JUNE 5, 2020

**Confluence**

- Described methodology is good. No discussion about some RFP components. Good experience. Good references. Good staff experience.
- Methodology was complete, but structural analysis listed as option when the RFP required this analysis. Good experience, no mention of skatepark option. No contacts listed in references. Would need to hire a local firm for the structural analysis.
- Very detailed approach for community input and design concepts. Confident they could accomplish the demands of the project.

**Counsilman Hunsaker**

- Described methodology is outstanding. Good experience with these types of studies. Not as many references listed. Excellent staff experience.
- Good project plan and description of how to provide complete study. Vast experience in aquatics, no mention of other areas. References were pool only.
- Variety of work for large and small communities. Appears previous projects have been creative and innovative. Local partner in PLJBD. Feel confident they would deliver on our needs.

**RDG**

- Described methodology is good. No discussion about some RFP components. Less experience with these studies listed. References not updated. Good staff experience.
- Well laid out plan on how to conduct the study. Ability to complete project evidenced by vast projects completed. Good experience, would like to see more open space and other play options. Would like more references on outdoor play. In-house staff to complete the project.
- Bid offers limited details on how they will collect their data.

**SFS Architecture**

- Described methodology is good. Some concern about public engagement methods. Good experience. Good references. Good staff experience.
- Great program detailed on how to conduct the study. Outstanding experience, especially ice skating. Great references. Well balanced project team.

- Similar to the other bids with nothing to set them apart from the others. References not as good.

**Vireo**

- Described methodology is good. No discussion about some components of RFP. Good experience with these types of studies. Good list of references. Good staff experience.
- Good described plan, but timeline is a concern. Good experience. Great references, good balance between aquatics and open play.
- They have the background to bring this project to life. Did not get a feel for developing the green space and making the park fully flow. Good references. Confident they could bring the project together, but feel limited on the creative, uniqueness we seek.

**Waters Edge**

- Described methodology is outstanding. Great experience with these types of studies. Outstanding references. Partner with good companies. Excellent staff experience.
- Methodology spelled out well. Good partners on this bid response. Good references for aquatic projects and open space projects. No reference for skate park component.
- The examples provided and their handling of stakeholders seem positive. Their use of green space will be important. Great approach to reach public input. Good creative aspects detailed. Presented Missouri-based projects. Confident this company will fully meet our needs and achieve successful results.

# EWERT POOL STUDY FINALIST INTERVIEW PRESENTATION

1. Introduce us to your point person/team that will lead this study.
2. Describe how you will complete the study outlined in the RFP.
3. Describe how you will incorporate public input in the process.
4. Describe your experience with this type of study.
5. Describe your past experience in completing the recommendation from the study.
6. Describe your experience with studying and transforming facilities such as Ewert Pool.
7. Describe how you determine the best use of the location now and well into the future.
8. Describe how you determine the financial sustainability of the option/recommendation.

CITY OF JOPLIN
EWERT POOL STUDY
FINAL OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE
15-Jun-20

| VENDOR NAME | SCORE | SCORE | SCORE | SCORE | TOTAL SCORE | OVERALL AVG SCORE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Waters Edge | 50 | 47 | 47 | 45 | 189 | 47.25 |
| Counsilman Hunsaker | 48 | 44 | 46 | 40 | 178 | 44.50 |
| RDG | 36 | 43 | 42 | 40 | 161 | 40.25 |

# SUMMARY OF FINAL COMMENTS FOR RFP ANALYSIS

# EWERT POOL STUDY

# JUNE 15, 2020

**Counsilman Hunsaker**

- Described needs assessment, facility program & space requirements, operations & business plan. 2 onsite meetings. Listened to council presentation on RFP development. Good examples for each type of option we are seeking. Great public outreach. Community engagement specialists. Look at impact on all pools, don't want recommendation to impact other pools. Great experience from study to completion.
- 3 prong needs assessment. Add value. Meet with task force and stake holders. A lot of parks experience, trail design and pool redesigns. Good record of cost projections.
- Their methodology is very thorough. They have laid out a good plan to complete the study. Great experience. Some ideas outside the box. Have researched Joplin. Didn't hear a skatepark representative.

**RDG**

- In-house skill set. Park Planning. Study is marketing plan. Spends time on project. Community project. Design professionals for each perspective. Public input-discover, assess, strategy, regional map, project greenlight. 3 workshops. Good study experience. Natural playscape. All options presented would be at an extra cost not included in the cost provided.
- Visit several times for a few days to do studies. Look at it as a community project. Develop a marketing plan and cost estimate. "Discover, assess, strategy". Skate park experience. Parks planning is what they do. Has used grants.
- I like their approach with project, except no definite plan on the skatepark portion. Gave impression they would decide the option, not community/stakeholders. Have projects outside the box.

**Waters Edge**

- Lots of studies-69 in past 5 years. Identify need, determine feasibility, create the plan. Tools to refine guided decisions. Benchmark to other cities. 2 open public meetings. Will set up project website. Educate public in order to get good public input. Focus group meetings. Feasibility and financial impact. Decision making matrix.
- Have plan in place. Assess pool and gather data. Identify needs. Market analysis. Meet with groups, survey, meet stakeholders. Many water projects, 69 in last 5 years. Partner with ARC for skatepark portion.

- I like their approach with their 3-step phase and how they will reach out to the community. Indicated that we shouldn't duplicate what we already have. Very solid firm, good work.