City of Newton *Purchasing Dept*.

COMPARISON RFP#22-31

Tennis Court Management Services

OPENING: December 30, 2021 at 10:30 am

Notes Regarding Specific Bids

PROJECT MANAGERS: Nicole Banks

PROPOSER	Evaluation	Addendum	Total
JXS Tennis Inc 55 Tillotson Rd Apt 5 Needham, Ma 02494	Disqualified	3	n/a
TSM Tennis 2430 Beacon Street #201 Chestnut Hill, Ma 02467	НА	3	\$130,000
USTA New England 110 Turnpike Rd Westborough, Ma 01581	Disqualified	3	n/a
Sudbury Racquet Club d/b/a Play Tennis Newton 524 Boston Post Rd Wayland, Ma 01778	НА	3	\$131,000

TSM Tennis		
Awarded to/Options:	Eq.	Mayor or her designee Date
18969		
Vendor #		Org Code & Object Code
Nicole Banks Digitally signed by Nicole Banks Date: 2022.02.09 16:06:16 -05'00'		2.10.22
Department Head	Date	Chief Procurement Officer Date

City of Newton Purchasing Department

To:

File

From:

N. Read, Chief Procurement Officer

Date:

February 10, 2022

Re:

RFP 22-31 Tennis Court Management Services

On 12/16/21 the city released RFP 22-31 for vendors to maintain and operate the City's tennis courts, including providing tennis instruction. Three addenda were issued. Proposals were to be submitted by 1/20/22, and 4 Tennis Management Firms (TMFs) duly submitted proposals:

JXS Tennis Inc 55 Tillotson Road Apt 5 Needham, Massachusetts 02494

TSM Tennis 2430 Beacon Street #201 Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02467

USTA New England
110 Turnpike Rd
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581

Sudbury Racquet Club d/b/a Play Tennis Newton 524 Boston Post Rd Wayland, Massachusetts 01778 An evaluation committee made up of three persons¹ reviewed the technical proposals. The evaluations were delivered to the Purchasing Department on 1/28/22, whereupon the price proposals were opened.

Copies of the Price Proposals of the responsive proposers are attached.

The evaluators first considered whether or not TMFs met the Minimum Criteria. They determined that two of the TMFs—USTA New England (no clay court facility maintenance plan) and JXS Tennis Inc. (no experience directing a tennis program)—did not meet the Minimum Criteria. Accordingly, no further action was taken for these.

The remaining 2 TMFs were ranked on the Comparative Criteria as follows:

Sudbury Racquet Club d/b/a Play Tennis Newton

	SL	RM	NB	
	A. COURT MA	NAGEMENT		
The ability of the Tennis Management Firm to manage, maintain and operate public Har-Tru tennis courts.	НА	НА	А	
2. Tennis Management Firm's plan to provide required maintenance at the Newton Centre Tennis Courts that would make available a level of play that is comparable to area public and private outdoor clay tennis courts.	НА	НА	HA	
B. (CITY WIDE LES	SON PROGRA	M	
1. Promotions and Marketing. The extent of Tennis Management Firm's experiences promoting a municipal tennis program and/or a community tennis association by marketing directly through the schools via an advertising campaign.	НА	НА	НА	

¹ S. Lapham, R. McLaughlin & N. Banks.

2. The extent of experience promoting a municipal tennis program and/or a community tennis association through online marketing and advertising.	No ranking given	НА	НА	
3. The extent of experience to offer different levels of tennis lessons from beginner to competitive.	No ranking given	НА	НА	
4. The extent of experience to include youth, men's, women's, senior and mixed double leagues	НА	НА	НА	
5. The extent of experience to include children's camps and clinics.	НА	НА	НА	
C. L	EADERSHIP Q	UALIFICATION	IS	
1. The extent of Tennis Management Firm's experience directing, promoting and administering a tennis program for a population of 50,000 or more	НА	НА	НА	
2.Demonstrates a track record of success directing a municipal tennis program which has an enrollment of at least 2,000 per year.	No ranking given	НА	НА	
3.Provide documentation of experience teaching different levels/types of classes.	HA	НА	НА	
Composite	НА	HA	HA	HA

TSM Tennis

	SL	RM	NB	
	A. COURT MAN	AGEMENT		
The ability of the Tennis Management Firm to manage, maintain and operate public Har-Tru tennis courts.	НА	НА	А	
2. Tennis Management Firm's plan to provide required maintenance at the Newton Centre Tennis Courts that would make available a level of play that is comparable to area public and private outdoor clay tennis courts.	HA	НА	HA	
B. W.		ESSON PROG		
1. Promotions and Marketing. The extent of Tennis Management Firm's experiences promoting a municipal tennis program and/or a community tennis association by marketing directly through the schools via an advertising campaign.	НА	НА	HA	
2. The extent of experience promoting a municipal tennis program and/or a community tennis association through online marketing and advertising.	HA	НА	НА	
3. The extent of experience to offer different levels of tennis lessons from beginner to competitive.	НА	НА	НА	
4. The extent of experience to include youth, men's, women's, senior and mixed double leagues	НА	НА	НА	
5. The extent of experience to include children's camps and clinics.	НА	А	HA	

	TEADEDOLUB	OLIALIEIOATIO		
1. The extent of Tennis Management Firm's experience directing, promoting and administering a tennis program for a population of 50,000 or more	LEADERSHIP HA	HA HA	HA	
2.Demonstrates a track record of success directing a municipal tennis program which has an enrollment of at least 2,000 per year.	НА	НА	НА	
3.Provide documentation of experience teaching different levels/types of classes.	No ranking given	НА	НА	
Composite	HA	HA	HA	HA

Both proposers received the highest possible ratings.

The proposed contract is a revenue-generating contract, i.e., the TMF will pay to the City a stated portion of its revenue (20% of annual gross revenue) but in any event an annual guaranteed minimum payment ("GMP"), which the TMF was to provide in its Price Proposal.

The rankings of the two proposers and their proposed GMPs are as follows:

Proposer	Ranking	GMP
Sudbury Racquet Club d/b/a Play	HA	\$131,000
Tennis Newton		
TSM Tennis	HA	\$130,000

Both TMFs were ranked Highly Advantageous and their GMPs are only \$1,000—less than 1%--apart. In other words, the proposals are identical in all material respects. Strictly speaking, the contract should be awarded to Sudbury Racquet Club d/b/a Play Tennis Newton, as it is the highest proposer. However, awarding to the highest proposer is not required. The statute provides that

[i]f the chief procurement officer awards the contract to an offeror who did not submit the lowest price, the chief procurement officer shall explain the reasons for the award in writing, specifying in reasonable detail the basis for determining that the quality of supplies or services under the contract will not exceed the governmental body's actual needs.

M.G.L. c.30B, §6(h).

The evaluators revisited the Technical Proposals of the responsive and responsible proposers. Their conclusions were as follows:

- 1. TMS introduction outlines all aspects of a business plan including lessons, marketing and diversity of offerings. Play Tennis Newton's introduction emphasizes on teaching ethic and outcomes only.
- 2. TMS emphasizes marketing strategies thought out the proposal that far exceeds Play Tennis Newton strategies. This will be important to significantly grow programming.
- 3. TMS presents their three Principals as a team complementing each other's strengths and defining specific roles. Play Tennis Newton presents its company as Principal Mike Lewitt's accomplishments and Principal Hamel and Parish filling in gaps of experience that Lewitt lacks. There is no indication or defined roles.

The forgoing demonstrates the superior technical qualifications of TSM Tennis. Accordingly I recommend that the tennis management services contract be awarded to TSM Tennis as the most advantageous proposer, based on its Technical and Price Proposals.

I certify that awarding the contract to TMS Tennis will not exceed the City's actual needs.

Attachment A

Price Proposal

Price Proposal - RFP#22-31 - Tennis Court Management Services

Newton Centre Clay Tennis Courts Maintenance and Management & City Wide Tennis Lessons

This form must be completed and placed in a separate sealed envelope marked

"Price Proposal - RFP #22-31-Tennis Court Management Services"

Nar	ne of Firm or Individual Submitting Proposal: (Please Print Clearly) SUDBURY RACQUET CCUB, Inc. DBA/Play Tennis Hewton
	dress:
5	24 BOSFER POST RD WAYLAND, MA 01778
Tet	ephone / PAX#:
5	08 358 7355
B-11	HAMMEL O BANIL. COM
Pro	poser acknowledges the following Addenda: 22-31 ADD-2, 22-31 ADD-2, 22-31 ADD-3
	ove Proposer will pay to the City of Newton the greater of a guaranteed minimum payment ("GMP") of
	ONE HUNDRED THIRTY-ONE THOUSAND Dollars (\$ 131,000)
	wenty percent (20%) of the annual gross revenue from the maintenance of the clay tennis courts, tennis lessons and private sons. Gross revenue shall include private lesson income.
Sig	nature of Tennis Management Firm:
Nar Sui	me of Tennis Management Firm: DBORY RACOVET CCUB, Inc. DBW/PlayTennisNewton
Dat	e: 1)17)22

Attachment A

Price Proposal

Price Proposal - RFP#22-31 - Tennis Court Management Services

Newton Centre Clay Tennis Courts Maintenance and Management & City Wide Tennis Lessons

This form must be completed and placed in a **separate** sealed envelope marked

"Price Proposal - RFP #22-31-Tennis Court Management Services"

Name of Firm or Individual Submitting Proposal: (Please Print Clearly) TSM FNN
Address:
2430 BEACON St. "201 CHESTNUT HILL, MA 02467
Telephone / FAX #:
917 596 0746
E-mail Address: TIM. TSM TRUNIS LLC & gmail. com or MARK. TSM TENNIS LLC & gmail. com
Proposer acknowledges the following Addenda: /, 2, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Above Proposer will pay to the City of Newton the greater of a guaranteed minimum payment ("GMP") of One hadred and thirty thousand Dollars (\$ 130,000)
or twenty percent (20%) of the annual gross revenue from the maintenance of the clay tennis courts, tennis lessons and private lessons. Gross revenue shall include private lesson income.
Signature of Tennis Management Firm:
Name of Tennis Management Firm: ISM IENNIL LLC ®
Date: 1/12/2022