



**CONCESSIONS AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE
OF THE PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD**

Tuesday, January 12, 2016 - 12:00 p.m.

Parks and Recreation Department Main Office

200 South Lamar Blvd.

Austin, Texas 78704

MINUTES

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 12:02 p.m.

Board Members in Attendance:

Michael Casias, Rick Cofer, Richard DePalma, Francoise Luca

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Richard DePalma made a motion to approve the minutes of the Concessions and Contracts Committee meeting of October 13, 2015. Committee Member Cofer seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

There were no requests or comments from Austin citizens at the January 12, 2016, Concessions and Contracts Committee.

D. NEW BUSINESS: DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (Copies of the reports can be found at http://www.austintexas.gov/cityclerk/boards_commissions/meetings/39_1.htm.)

2. Make a recommendation to the Parks and Recreation Board regarding authorization to negotiate and to execute an agreement with the successful proposer, Rippner Tennis, Inc., for the management and operation of the South Austin Tennis Center.
 - a. Lonnie Lyman, Event Coordinator Senior, made a presentation to members that focused on the following:
 - b. Background and History of Facility:
 - i. Center was built in 1981 and has a Pro Shop, storage and office space, 600 square feet of retail space, 10 lighted tennis courts, and one practice wall
 - ii. Averages over \$85,000 annually from court fees
 - c. Current Status/In-House vs. Contractor Facility Operation
 - i. Current vendor is Rippner Tennis Company; in good standing
 - ii. Initial three-year contract term (2007) with two three-year extension options; both options executed
 - iii. Current annual management fee paid to contractor is \$36,000
 - iv. Cost for City staff to operate would be \$95,000, based on two FTE and part-time/seasonal employees

- d. Community Engagement:
 - i. PARD staff met with major local Tennis Associations
 - ii. Six-week survey conducted through “SpeakUp Austin” in June-July 2014, to help shape Scope of Work for tennis centers’ Request For Proposals (RFP)
 - iii. Over 700 responses received
 - iv. Results of survey shaped Scope of Work:
 - 1. Major focus on customer service
 - 2. Online reservations
 - 3. Daily use – Maximizing court usage
 - 4. Social media and marketing
- e. Request for Proposal Goals and Contract Elements
 - i. Goals and Objectives: Through its municipal tennis facilities, PARD strives to offer the community an open, positive, and inviting atmosphere for players of all ages and skill levels to participate in year-round tennis
 - ii. Major Elements of Contract:
 - 1. Initial three-year term with two three-year extension options
 - 2. Contractor Responsibilities:
 - a. Operation of Facility
 - b. Programming
 - c. Tennis Services
 - d. Collection of Council-approved Fees
 - e. Good Customer Service
 - f. Promote Activities through Marketing and Advertising
- f. Request for Proposals Process:
 - i. Proposals accepted during four-week period (Sept. 28-Oct. 29, 2015)
 - ii. Corporate Purchasing Office received one proposal that met minimum qualifications and elected to extend the acceptance period by one week
 - iii. One additional proposal was received
- g. Proposal Evaluation Criteria
 - i. Operation and Management Experience
 - ii. Personnel Qualifications
 - iii. Financial Viability
 - iv. Local Presence
 - v. Optional Interview
- h. Evaluation Team Members:
 - i. Golf Complex Professional Manager
 - ii. Two Recreation Program Managers
 - iii. Event Coordinator Senior
 - iv. Recreation Program Supervisor
 - v. PARD Contract Administrator
- i. Evaluation Results:
 - i. Rippner Tennis, Inc., current vendor in good standing, was identified as the successful proposer
 - ii. Demonstrated capacity to deliver the requirements outlined in the scope within the project budget
- j. Next Steps:
 - i. Parks and Recreation Board – January 26, 2016
 - ii. City Council – February 25, 2016.
- k. Members had the following questions and comments:
 - i. When and how was the decision made to outsource management of the tennis facilities? *PARD staff calculated how many FTE’s would be needed to staff a facility based on the staffing of recreational centers and the hours the facility would be open.*

Staff provided this information to the PARD's executive team who made the decision to outsource management and operation services.

- ii. Members discussed examining how PARD operates other facilities such as Cultural Arts facilities. A member asked if the Auditor's Office conducts analysis of what is needed for facility operations. *PARD has an internal auditor who performs these functions.*
 - iii. A member asked about the scoring criteria relating to local presence. *The Purchasing Office representative noted that the Austin City Council has a policy objective of trying to keep dollars in the area when possible. The 10 points allotted conform to standard practices. A member noted that San Antonio allots 15 points for local presence.*
 - iv. A member asked where the other proposer, Lifetime Tennis, Inc., is located. *Its headquarters is in California. It operates three tennis facilities in Texas.*
 - v. How long must an entity reside to qualify for local presence? *Five years.*
 - vi. Is the percentage of employees in Austin considered? *No.*
 - vii. Did Lifetime propose a similar amount as Rippner? *This information relates to the content of the proposal and cannot be publicly disseminated.*
 - viii. As Rippner is the entity on site, did this increase its rating in the applicable experience and personnel qualifications area? *Any entity can be rated better than another. In this instance, there was only a four-point difference. The rating is about how a facility is generally operated; it is not Austin specific. The 30 points in this category also relate to personnel qualifications provided in proposals, which do not always relate to the number of years an entity has been in business.*
1. Committee members unanimously agreed to place the item on the PARB consent agenda.
3. Make a recommendation to the Parks and Recreation Board to accept the Concessions and Contracts Annual Report for 2015
 - a. Pat Rossett, Contract Administrator, reviewed the revised draft report with members.
 - b. Members had the following questions and comments:
 - i. The Chairman asked if there was any additional input.
 1. There was a discussion on what the committee could do to look for opportunities for additional and innovative concessions on parkland.
 2. A member requested the total values of the contracts be added.
 - c. Committee members unanimously agreed to place the item on the PARB non-consent agenda.

E. BRIEFINGS (*Briefings are informational items only, no action was taken*) [A copy of the briefing can be found at http://www.austintexas.gov/cityclerk/boards_commissions/meetings/39_1.htm.]

4. Kevin Gomillion, Division Manager of Golf Services, provided a briefing regarding the solicitation for a vendor to provide food concession services for Jimmy Clay and Roy Kizer Golf Courses. Highlights of the briefing include the following:
 - a. Background:
 - i. Current concessionaire, Players, has operated concession since 2003
 - ii. Contract expires June 2016
 - iii. Players also operates concessions at Lions and Morris Williams Golf Courses
 - b. Fiscal Impact
 - i. Net sales and revenue to City for FY 2011 through 2015 provided
 - ii. Impact from renovations and flooding repairs over the past three years
 - c. Terms and Conditions
 - i. Facility is limited in space and in need of updates and repairs

- ii. To allow for capital investment, looking at an agreement with a longer term
- d. Golf Community Survey
 - i. 138 responses; survey closed 1/10/16
 - ii. Survey had 10 questions related to concession
 - iii. Survey comments included:
 - 1. Emphasis on outdoor eating area
 - 2. Expanded breakfast menu and healthy food options
 - 3. Focus on breakfast and lunch options
- e. Proposed Timeline:
 - i. RPF posting in February
 - ii. Present recommendation to Concessions and Contracts Committee in May
 - iii. Present recommendation to Parks and Recreation Department Board in May
 - iv. Present recommendation to City Council in October.
- f. Members had the following questions and comments:
 - i. How has current concessionaire performed? *Players has met the needs and has done all that has been requested. At one time, Players experimented with expanding the food options, but those options were not embraced by the clientele. A golf concession requires a unique kind of service. It must be quick and something that golfers can take out on the course to eat. The challenge has been in encouraging the clientele to spend more time at the concession. Some feel that the drinks are overpriced.*
 - ii. What are the beer choices? Do the choices represent what Austin drinks? *This information has been provided to Players.*
 - iii. What are the hours of operation? *Averages from seven to seven, depending on how much daylight there is.*
 - iv. Would it be possible to expand the hours? *Yes, if there were clients to serve.*
 - v. How many parking spaces are there? *Approximately 500.*
 - vi. What percentage of the revenue does the golf enterprise receive from the concession? *It depends on the concession's annual revenue. Five percent if the sales are up to \$400,000, 10% of sales over \$400,000, and 20% on sales over \$425,000.*
 - vii. Will the qualifications limit this to be a Sports Bar? *The solicitation is being written to require management and operation of a food establishment; no golf experience is needed.*
 - viii. How many people go through the complex in a day? *It varies per day, but there are approximately 120,000 rounds of golf played annually. It also varies per season. On a good day, 180 people come to the complex.*
 - ix. A member felt 138 survey results were low and perhaps the golf demographic is older and less technologically informed. It was suggested that perhaps the survey should be sent to physical addresses versus email addresses. Another member commented that there should be an effort to capture more than just the golf community and appeal to the community nearby that may not be interested in golfing, but would like a place to eat and hang out. A member noted that Top Golf makes more money and includes a vegetarian option.
 - x. A discussion ensued about the demographic served and what this group's preferences may be. *Staff noted that the concession cannot serve hard liquor. Because golfers are allowed to bring their own food and beverages, including wine and beer, the concession may only obtain a license for wine and beer.*
 - xi. The discussion expanded to examining other concession opportunities in other parkland locations, such as Walnut Creek. It was suggested that a Request for Information related to concession ideas be developed. Someone else suggested that a Social Media Campaign be launched.

F. COMMITTEE COORDINATOR REPORT

5. Contract compliance staff, Pat Rossett and Idella Wilson, briefed members on PARD contracts that are in development.
 - i. Members asked that the report reflect all contracts through 2016.

G. FUTURE ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

There were no requests made.

H. ADJOURNMENT

Michael Casias adjourned the meeting at 1:12 p.m.

DRAFT