

City of South San Francisco

Capital Projects

Jacob Gilchrist, Director

400 Grand Ave, South San Francisco, CA 94080

EVALUATION TABULATION

RFP No. pk2201

Orange Memorial Park Aquatic Center

RESPONSE DEADLINE: December 15, 2021 at 12:00 pm Report Generated: Friday, February 25, 2022

PHASE 2 - INTERVIEWS

EVALUATORS

Name	Title	
B Crume	Program Manager	
Angela Duldulao	Recreation Manager	
Greg Mediati	Deputy Director, Parks and Recreation	
Brian Noce	Acting Recreation Supervisor	
Sharon Ranals	Assistant City Manager/P&R Director	
Joshua Richardson	Parks Manager	
Devin Stenhouse	Recreation Supervisor	
Philip Vitale	Deputy Director	

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Description	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Sustainability and Design Excellence: Balancing beauty and durability	The Orange Memorial Park Swimming Pool is one of the most popular Cityowned amenities in SSF. How would your team help us balance beauty and durability in the new Aquatic Center?	0-10 Points	10 (7.7% of Total)
2. Sustainability and Design Excellence: SSF unique attributes	What do you see as unique attributes of South San Francisco, and how would you integrate those into the aquatic center design?	0-10 Points	10 (7.7% of Total)
3. Sustainability and Design Excellence: Context of the larger park	Orange Memorial Park is the heart of South San Francisco as the focal point of team sports, community gatherings, events, and recreation. How would your team plan to integrate the aquatic center within the context of the larger community park?	0-10 Points	10 (7.7% of Total)
4. Sustainability and Design Excellence: Sustainability certifications	What experience do you have with LEED and other sustainability certifications for pools/aquatic centers?	0-10 Points	10 (7.7% of Total)
5. Sustainability and Design Excellence: All-electric pool/aquatic center The City of South San Francisco is moving away from natural gas in new construction. Please describe the considerations and processes involved to design, maintain and operate an all-electric pool/aquatic center.		0-10 Points	10 (7.7% of Total)

Criteria Description		Scoring Method	Weight (Points)	
6. Innovation in Aquatic Center Design: Emerging trends in aquatic recreation	What do you see as emerging trends in aquatic recreation, and how would you integrate them into a more traditional pool complex?	0-10 Points	10 (7.7% of Total)	
7. Innovation in Aquatic Center Design: Equipment replacement and maintenance	How do you propose we design an innovative pool system yet utilize equipment that will remain readily available for replacement and maintenance?		10 (7.7% of Total)	
8. Innovation in Aquatic Center Design: In-house operated and maintained systems	We currently conduct general maintenance of our pool system. How would you design a system that can be maintained and operated in-house?	0-10 Points	10 (7.7% of Total)	
9. Public Project Experience: Community Engagement			10 (7.7% of Total)	
O. Public Project Experience: Ompeting desires What experience do you have working with community interest groups (swim teams, seniors, youth, etc.) with competing desires? Please describe your strategies used to find common ground amongst these groups?		0-10 Points	10 (7.7% of Total)	

Criteria	Description	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
11. Public Project Experience: Various stakeholder influences	There is an expectation that the design team will present iterations of the designs to several stakeholder groups. In your experience, how do City Councils, Commissions, and various stakeholders influence the design? How would you help us consider these influences when designing the aquatic center?	0-10 Points	10 (7.7% of Total)
12. Budget: Escalation	Construction costs in the Bay Area have been increasing rapidly in recent years. How would you approach design to account for escalation? And how would you reconcile stakeholder desires/wants with the project budget while accounting for escalation?		10 (7.7% of Total)
13. Budget: Fee	If we ask you to sharpen your pencil, how would you approach reducing your overall fee?		10 (7.7% of Total)

Vendor	11. Public Project Experience: Various stakeholder influences 0-10 Points 10 Points (7.7%)	12. Budget: Escalation 0-10 Points 10 Points (7.7%)	<u>13. Budget: Fee</u> 0-10 Points 10 Points (7.7%)	Total Score (Max Score 130)
ELS Architecture and Urban Design	8.4	8	7	108.13
Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning	7.9	8.3	8.5	105.88
WRNS Studio	7.4	7.9	7.3	100
Barker Rinker Seacat Architecture Excluded	0	0	0	0
Marcy Wong Donn Logan Excluded	0	0	0	0