

EVALUATION REPORT

**Proposals Received on July 9, 2013 in Response to
Request for Proposals for Operation and
Management of a Public Nine-Hole Golf Course at
Lincoln Park West, a Hudson County Park, Located
at the Southwest Corner of the Intersection of US
Routes 1&9 and Duncan Avenue
in the City of Jersey City, County of Hudson,
State of New Jersey**

Prepared for:

Hudson County Improvement Authority

By:

**The Hudson County Improvement Authority
Evaluation Team**

Dated:

August 9, 2013

Evaluation Report Table of Contents

Report Sections	Page
Executive Summary	2
1. Overview of the RFP	6
2. Responses to RFP	9
3. Proposal Evaluation Matrix	11
4. Financial Benefits and Cost Proposal Evaluation	12
5. Technical /Approach	13
6. Respondents' Experience	14
7. Financial Background	16
8. Oral Interview Evaluation	17
9. Recommendation – Successful Respondent	18
 Attachments	
Evaluation Matrix	Att. 1

Executive Summary

This Report is being provided pursuant to the requirements of the competitive contracting provisions of the Local Public Contracts Law (N.J.S.A. 40A:11-4.1.b.(2)). The purpose of the Evaluation Report is to provide the Hudson County Improvement Authority ("HCIA") with an evaluation of proposals received, and to provide a recommendation to the HCIA.

The goal of the HCIA in administering the competitive contracting process is to obtain proposals from qualified firms capable of providing operation and management services, under a five-year contract, for the proposed Lincoln Park West 9-hole golf course that will be environmentally responsible and economically beneficial to Hudson County, its residents and the HCIA. To this end, on May 31, 2013, the HCIA issued a Request for Proposals (RFP), as amended, for a five-year qualified management contract ("Contract") for the operation and management, including Construction Phase Services, by the successful respondent to the RFP (Successful Respondent) for the golf course and related facilities to be constructed at Lincoln Park West ("Golf Course").

The HCIA sought proposals on two mandatory options. Option 1 included operation and management services, including Golf Course Maintenance Services. Option 2 included operation and management services, excluding Golf Course Maintenance Services. Respondents were required to propose on both options. Under both proposal options, Respondents were also required to propose a monthly fee for Construction Phase Services to assist the HCIA during the construction of the Golf Course. In addition, under both options, Respondents were allowed to propose an Annual Incentive Payment that they would be entitled to expressed in the form of a percentage of the Net Revenues in excess of the Annual Operating Budget for the last two years of the Contract term. Under the RFP, the HCIA retains sole discretion to select the option under which the Contract will be awarded.

The RFP contained specific permitting information associated with the Golf Course as well as information related to the on-going rough shaping of the Golf Course. Respondents were also able to review the bid documents associated with the Golf Course construction contract bid that was issued by the HCIA on July 11, 2013.

As set forth in the RFP, the Successful Respondent and the HCIA will enter into a five (5) year Contract under which the HCIA will pay the Successful Respondent to provide certain services in connection with the operation and management of the Golf Course both during and after construction of the Golf Course. This

Contract structure provides the County and the HCIA with a qualified firm capable of expertly assisting in the construction of, managing, operating, maintaining, and promoting the Golf Course.

The RFP also requires the Successful Respondent enter into a First Source Agreement with the HCIA, which will require the Successful Respondent to hire qualified Hudson County residents before offering any position to any out-of-county individuals.

In addition, regardless of the proposal Option that is selected, the HCIA, in consultation with the County, will retain the ability to establish and/or modify all fees charged to the public to utilize the Golf Course.

To evaluate proposals, the HCIA organized an evaluation team comprised of: Norman M. Guerra, Chief Executive Officer of the HCIA; Kurt A. Cherry, Executive Director/CFO of the HCIA; William J. Netchert, Esq., General Counsel to the HCIA; Michael O'Connor, Project Manager of the HCIA; Kenneth L. Jennings Jr., Assistant Division Chief Department of Parks and Community Service, Hudson County; ier Ryan J. Scerbo, Esq., of DeCotiis, FitzPatrick & Cole, LLP, Michael Cohen, Paulus, Sokolowski and Sartor, LLC, and Dennis Enright, NW Financial (collectively, Evaluation Team). The Evaluation Team assisted in developing and implementing the RFP, administered the procurement process, conducted oral interviews and drafted this Evaluation Report for the HCIA.

The procurement and evaluation process was undertaken in accordance with the competitive contracting provisions of the Local Public Contracts Law (specifically N.J.S.A. 40A:11-4.1.b.(2)), and all other applicable law.

The HCIA received two proposals to the RFP, one from Kemper Sports Management, Inc. (Kemper) and one from Billy Casper Golf, LLC (Casper).

The Evaluation Team conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the proposals submitted by Kemper and Casper based upon price and other factors, as set forth in detail in this Evaluation Report. The Evaluation Team conducted an interview with each Respondent as part of the evaluation process.

The evaluation of each proposal was conducted in accordance with an evaluation matrix (Evaluation Matrix) that is based on a total potential score of 100. The proposals were evaluated based upon the following criteria and weighting factors:

Financial Benefits (30)	Total Annual Contract Payment
	Coordination of Construction Activities

Annual Incentive Payment

Technical Design/Approach (10) Project Team Approach

Respondent Experience (30) Project Management
Contractor Expertise
Project Experience
New Jersey Experience

Financial Strength (20) Financial Capability/Strength of Provider

Oral Interview Evaluation (10) Presentation
Explanation Key Factors
Understanding Financial Factors/SREC Market

After reviewing each proposal and conducting an interview, the Evaluation Team scored the proposals in accordance with the established criteria above. The chart below summarizes the scores each proposal received:

Proposer	Option	Score
Kemper Sports Management, Inc.	1 (with Maintenance Services)	90
Kemper Sports Management, Inc.	2 (without Maintenance Services)	85
Billy Casper Golf, LLC	1 (with Maintenance Services)	87
Billy Casper Golf, LLC	2 (without Maintenance Services)	82

Summary of Benefits

The objectives of the HCIA's RFP are to contract with a firm qualified and capable of providing operation and management services, under a five (5) year contract, for the Golf Course in a manner that will provide the residents of Hudson County and the rest of the public with an affordable and unique recreational opportunity currently absent from the County.

The basic terms of Kemper's and Casper's proposals are set forth in detail in **Tables 1 and 2** on pages 9 and 10 of this Report.

All of the proposals received by the HCIA will allow the County and the HCIA to realize the following benefits:

1. Obtain Construction Phase Services from a firm qualified and experienced in the development of golf courses.
2. Obtain operation and management services for a set fee for multiple years.
3. Provide the public with an exceptional golfing experience and provide opportunities to expand public interest in golfing.
4. Monitor the year-to-year use of the Golf Course and utilize programs intended to retain repeat golfers and draw new golfers.

Overview of the RFP

On May 31, 2013, the HCIA issued an RFP for a Contract to be entered into by and between the HCIA and a Successful Respondent under which the successful respondent would be responsible for the operation and management of the Golf Course. The RFP provided for two proposal options. Respondents were required to propose on both Options. Option 1 included operation and management services, including Golf Course Maintenance Services, and Construction Phase Services. Option 2 included operation and management services, and Construction Phase Services, but excluding Golf Course Maintenance Services. In addition all Respondents were allowed to propose an Annual Incentive Payment that they would be entitled to expressed in the form of a percentage of the Net Revenues in excess of the Annual Operating Budget for the last two years of the Contract term. Under the RFP, the HCIA retains sole discretion to select the option under which the Contract will be awarded.

The Successful Respondent and the HCIA will enter into a Contract for five (5) years, the maximum duration permitted by State law, under which the HCIA will compensate the Successful Respondent for operation and management services on annual basis as well as fund the operating budgets for the Golf Course.

Proposals were to be evaluated on the basis of price and non-price criteria, in accordance with competitive contracting provisions of the Public School Contracts Law (N.J.S.A. 40A:11-4.1 et seq.), and applicable law.

Components of the RFP are summarized as follows:

The Golf Course

At 273 acres, Lincoln Park is the largest of the eight parks under the supervision of the Hudson County Division of Parks. Designed by landscape architects Daniel W. Langton and Charles N. Lowrie, Lincoln Park opened in 1907.

Lincoln Park is divided into Lincoln Park East and Lincoln Park West. Lincoln Park West consists of 169 acres located at the southwest corner of the intersection of US Routes 1&9 and Duncan Avenue in Jersey City. Lincoln Park West has frontage along the Hackensack River.

A 65-acre section of Lincoln Park West (the "Golf Course Site") is being redeveloped through the completion of a Landfill Closure and the construction of a 9-hole public golf course project being undertaken by the Authority. Approximately 40 acres of the Golf Course Site have been classified by NJDEP as a former landfill, with the remaining 25 acres classified as non-landfill. The entire

area will be capped with a sand cover material -- previously supplied and stockpiled on site -- that will serve as the base for construction of the 9-hole golf course. Capping of the landfill will be completed in accordance with the NJDEP Landfill Closure Approval.

The Golf Course Site, as part of Lincoln Park, is owned by the County. The County has leased the Golf Course Site to the Authority and has designated the Authority to undertake certain activities on the Site. To this end, the Authority has completed the golf course design and has prepared the Golf Course Site for construction by completing the rough grading and installation of certain deep drainage facilities. The HCIA is currently in the process of seeking bids for the final grading and construction of the Golf Course.

Pricing Proposal

The RFP requested that Respondents provide the following:

Option 1 – Respondents were required to propose a Total Annual Contract Payment for each contract year under the Qualified Management Contract, **including** all Maintenance Services for the Golf Course.

Option 2 – Respondents were required to propose a Total Annual Contract Payment for each contract year under the Qualified Management Contract, **excluding** all Maintenance Services for the Golf Course.

Under both Options 1 and 2 all Respondents were required to propose a Total Monthly Contract Payment for Coordination of Construction Activities Services.

Respondent were permitted, but not required, to propose a percentage of the Net Revenue in excess of the Annual Operating Budget it would like to receive as an Annual Incentive Payment under the Contract beginning in contract year 4.

Scope of Golf Course Management Services

The RFP provided a Scope of Golf Course Management Services (Appendix A-4) to inform Respondents about what services they would be required to provide to the HCIA under the Contract.

The RFP also requires the Successful Respondent enter into a First Source Agreement with the HCIA, which will require the Successful Respondent to hire qualified Hudson County residents before offering any position to any out-of-county individuals.

In addition, regardless of the proposal Option that is selected, the HCIA, in consultation with the County, will retain the ability to establish and/or modify all fees charged to the public to utilize the Golf Course.

Form of Proposals and Required Forms

Proposals were required to include the following information about each Respondent:

- Respondent History/Qualifications; and
- Financial Qualifications.

Proposals were also required to include the following:

- Proposal Pricing Information specified in Appendix C of the RFP.
- Bonding requirements consistent with Article 4 of this RFP.
- Insurance Requirements consistent with Section 4.5 of the RFP.

Proposals must also include the following documents:

- i. New Jersey Business Registration Certificate
- ii. Non-Collusion Affidavit
- iii. Ownership Disclosure Statement
- iv. Affirmative Action Compliance
- v. Consent of Surety
- vi. Proposal Security
- vii. Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addenda
- viii. Consent to Investigation
- ix. Proposal Checklist

Evaluation Process

To evaluate the proposals, the HCIA organized the Evaluation Team and developed an Evaluation Matrix prior to the issuance of the RFP. The Evaluation Matrix includes a three-part process:

- Phase I (legal compliance) is a checklist to determine if the Respondent has included all documentation and information in its Proposal required by the RFP. Once all requirements have been satisfied, a Respondent qualifies to move to Phase II of the evaluation.

-
- Phase II is a weighted rating of the value provided by the proposal across several categories (financial benefits, technical / approach, proposer experience and financial strength) and evaluation of factors within those categories.
 - Phase III is an oral interview of qualified Respondents and the final step in the evaluation process.

The Respondent with the top ranking in Phases II and III will be recommended for award as the Successful Respondent.

2. Responses to RFP

The HCIA received two proposals to the RFP, one from Kemper and one from Casper.

The proposals provided all of the necessary documentation as required of Respondents by the RFP¹.

Tables 1 and 2 provide an overview of the proposals that were submitted to the HCIA.

Table 1: Kemper Overview of Received Proposal

Respondent	RFP Options	Monthly Construction Phase Services	Annual Contract Payments	Annual Incentive Payment
Kemper	Option 1 (with Maintenance Services)	\$14,000/ month*	**Contract Years 1 through 5 \$491,716	Contract Year 4 15% Contract Year 5 15%
Kemper	Option 2 (without Maintenance Services)	\$14,000/ month*	***Contract Years 1 through 5 \$404,716	Contract Year 4 15% Contract Year 5 15%

*This figure represents an average monthly cost which could vary over the course of the construction effort. During the interview process it was clarified to both Casper and Kemper that the HCIA was seeking a full-time individual to be on-site during construction of the Golf Course.

**These fees are based upon a 60 month contract term consisting approximately of 11 months of Construction Phase Services, 9 months of grow-in of the Golf Course and 40 months of operation and management of the Golf Course.

*** This fee was determined by subtracting the proposed fee under Option 2 from the clarified fee provided under Option 1.

¹ Each proposal contained some minor errors and omissions which were identified and clarified during the interview process.

Table 2: Casper Overview of Received Proposal

Respondent	RFP Options	Monthly Construction Phase Services	Annual Contract Payments	Annual Incentive Payment
Casper	Option 1 (with Maintenance Services)	\$ 11,000/ month*	**Contract Year 1 through 5: \$476,500	Contract Year 4 10% Contract Year 5 10%
Casper	Option 2 (without Maintenance Services)	\$ 11,000/ month*	***Contract Year 1 through 5: \$429,500	Contract Year 4 10% Contract Year 5 10%

*Casper's original proposal submission indicated a Monthly Construction Phase Services Fee of \$1,500. However, during the interview process it was clarified to both Casper and Kemper that the HCIA was seeking a full-time individual to be on-site during construction of the Golf Course. Based upon this information Casper clarified its proposal to reflect the fee noted above.

**These fees are based upon a 60 month contract term consisting approximately of 11 months of Construction Phase Services, 9 months of grow-in of the Golf Course and 40 months of operation and management of the Golf Course.

*** This fee was determined by subtracting the proposed fee under Option 2 from the clarified fee provided under Option 1.

3. Proposal Evaluation Matrix

Kemper's and Casper's proposals proceeded to Phase II and III evaluations in accordance with the process defined in the RFP. The evaluation was conducted pursuant to the Evaluation Matrix, which is based on a total potential score of 100. The Evaluation Matrix is broken into the following criteria and weighting factors

Financial Benefits (30)	Total Annual Contract Payment Coordination of Construction Activities Annual Incentive Payment
Technical Design/Approach (10)	Project Team Approach
Respondent Experience (30)	Project Management Contractor Expertise Project Experience New Jersey Experience
Financial Strength (20)	Financial Capability/Strength of Provider
Oral Interview Evaluation (10)	Presentation Explanation Key Factors Understanding of Services Requested

The Evaluation Matrix scoring is provided in **Attachment 1**. The following sections of this Evaluation Report provide a review of the evaluation criteria with respect to the proposals received.

4. Financial Benefits and Cost Proposal Evaluation

Below is a summary of the financial benefits upon which each proposal was evaluated. The Proposals were awarded points in the Evaluation Matrix based on the Respondent's responses to the following criteria:

- Total Annual Contract Payment
- Coordination of Construction Activities
- Annual Incentive Payment

The Evaluation Team carefully considered the fees proposed by each Respondent. During the interview process it became apparent the HCIA would be able to more thoroughly evaluate the fee proposals if it would view the proposed fees on a monthly basis over the term of the five (5) year Contract. The Evaluation Team sought and received from each Respondent a clarification of their fee proposals broken down over a monthly schedule established by the HCIA. One of the clarifications that the Evaluation Team requested from each Respondent was a breakdown of their Total Annual Contract Payments on a monthly basis along with their Coordination of Construction Activities monthly fee. These breakdowns are attached hereto as **Attachment 2**.

Kemper proposed a Total Annual Contract Payment that was approximately 3% higher than that proposed by Casper. Casper was awarded the maximum number of point under this criterion (20) and Kemper was awarded 19 points (3% less then Casper).

With respect to the criterion of Coordination of Construction activities, the Evaluation Team considered not only the fee proposed by a Respondent for Construction Phase Services but also the Respondent's demonstrated ability to provide such services in an efficient and exemplary manner. Although Casper's proposed fee for Construction Phase services was lower than Kemper's fee, Kemper demonstrated a greater degree of ability to provide the services necessary to the HCIA during the construction of the Golf Course. For this reason Kemper was awarded 4 out of 5 points under this criterion and Casper was awarded 2 out of 5 points.

Both firms proposed an Annual Incentive Payment that they would be entitled to, expressed as a percentage of the Net Revenues in excess of the Annual Operating Budget for the last two years of the Contract term. Casper proposed 10% and Kemper proposed 15%. Kemper was awarded 1 out of 5 points for this criterion and Casper received 2 out of 5 points.

5. Technical /Approach

The evaluation of technical/approach has several elements including schedules, project team approach and operation and maintenance plans.

Project Team Approach

Each Respondent demonstrated a highly skilled team of professionals capable of providing the services requested under the RFP in a coordinated and cost effective manner. Casper provided a detailed overview during its interview of the methods and technology it utilizes at other municipal/county owned courses to attract and retain golfers as well as increase bookings of tee-times during lulls in play. The marketing and technology aspects of Casper's presentation were impressive. Kemper also indicated that it employs similar methods to retain and gain golfers, however less detail was offered by Kemper during its interview. Based upon Casper's more detailed explanation of its approach to managing the use of the Golf Course, Casper was awarded the maximum number of points under this criterion (10) and Kemper was awarded 9 out of 10 points.

6. Respondent's Experience

Kemper and Casper were evaluated on experience, which includes the following elements:

- Project Management;
- Contractor Expertise;
- Project Experience; and
- New Jersey Experience.

Kemper has assembled an experienced and qualified project team. Firm qualifications, project experience and references were provided for Kemper and its team members.

Similarly, Casper has assembled an experienced and well qualified project team. Firm qualifications, project experience and references were provided for Casper and its team members.

Both firms were awarded 9 points under this criterion.

Project Management

Both Kemper and Casper assembled teams that have extensive experience in the management and operation of government owned golf courses. Both firms were awarded 5 points under this criterion.

Contractor Expertise

Both firms provided information in their respective proposals that clearly indicated their experience and ability to work with contractors during the construction of a golf course.

However, during the interview process, Kemper's team provided significant insight into the construction process and was better able to explain how and when it would be interacting with the various contractors that will be involved in the construction of the Golf Course when providing the HCIA with Construction Phase Services. Kemper was awarded 9 points and Casper was awarded 7 points under this criterion.

Project Experience

Both firms demonstrated an equal amount of experience and ability in the operation and management of public golf courses in locations across the United States. Both firms were awarded 9 points under this criterion.

New Jersey Experience

Kemper and Casper both have significant involvement with several New Jersey golf courses. For example, Kemper has been a part of the recent course improvements and club house construction at the nearby Galloping Hill Golf Course facility in Kenilworth, New Jersey. Likewise, Casper currently operates one of Morris County's more popular courses: Berkshire Valley in Oak Ridge, New Jersey. Based on both team's significant New Jersey experience, they were each awarded the maximum number of points in this category.

7. Financial Background

Financial Capability/Strength of Respondent

An evaluation of the financial strength of Respondents was undertaken by the HCIA's financial advisor.

Section 3.11 of the RFP required each respondent to provide the HCIA with following statements for the current fiscal year-to-date and the prior fiscal year: (i) balance statement detailing cash and cash equivalents, detailing current assets, current liabilities, stockholder equity, (ii) statement of operations detailing pre-tax earnings, and (iii) statement of cash flows.

Each Respondent provided the necessary information to the HCIA and answered subsequent questions generated by a review of the submitted material both during the interview process and after. Each firm was cooperative and responsive.

Based upon a review of the materials provided by each Respondent, each firm appears to be in equally acceptable financial positions. As such each Respondent was awarded 18 out of 20 points under this criterion.

8. Oral Interview Evaluation

Both Respondents were evaluated with respect to their presentation and answers to questions asked during the interview. This included an evaluation of each Respondent's presentation, explanation of key factors and understanding of financial factors.

Kemper Oral Interview Summary:

Kemper did an excellent job during its presentation, was able to explain key issues, and demonstrated an understanding of financial issues. Kemper brought

Kemper confirmed that it would have no issue utilizing the form of Qualified Management Contract included in the RFP. The following items were also noted and/or clarified during the oral interview:

1. Kemper attended the interview with a full complement of personnel including the firm's CFO.
2. Kemper provided a detailed presentation which detailed their background and experience in managing and operating public golf courses.
3. Kemper provided a detailed discussion concerning the special issues that can arise with the construction and grow-in of a new golf course.
4. Kemper agreed to communicate with the HCIA's financial advisor post interview to discuss Kemper's financial documents further.
5. Kemper agreed to clarify its proposed fees based upon the understanding that the HCIA will require a representative to be on-site at the Golf Course full-time during construction.
6. Kemper subsequently provided clarification concerning its fee proposal and monthly breakdown of its fees.

Casper Oral Interview Summary:

Casper also did an excellent job during its presentation, was able to explain key issues, and demonstrated an understanding of key technical and financial issues.

Casper also confirmed that it would have no issue utilizing the form of Qualified Management Contract included in the RFP. The following items were also noted and/or clarified during the oral interview:

1. Casper attended the meeting with several members its firm who were more than capable of addressing the questions of the Evaluation Team.
2. Casper provided a presentation to the Evaluation Team and then fielded questions from the Team.

-
3. Casper's presentation contained detailed information related to the methods and technology Casper employs to retain and gain golfers as well fill underutilized tee-time.
 4. Casper agreed to communicate with the HCIA's financial advisor post interview to discuss Casper's financial documents further.
 5. Casper agreed to clarify its proposed fees based upon the understanding that the HCIA will require a representative to be on-site at the Golf Course full-time during construction.
 6. Casper subsequently provided clarification concerning its fee proposal and monthly breakdown of its fees.

Because Kemper was able to provide a more detailed explanation of the key factors affecting the construction and initial operation of a new golf course and demonstrated a greater understanding of the services requested under the RFP during its interview with the HCIA, Kemper was awarded the maximum number of points for its interview and Casper was awarded 8 out of 10 points under this criterion.

Recommendation – Successful Respondent

In recommending that a Contract be awarded to Kemper as the Successful Respondent, the Evaluation Team reviewed Kemper's proposal for legal compliance, as well as technical, experience, qualifications and financial strength requirements set forth by the RFP. The Evaluation Team also conducted an interview allowing Kemper to present and clarify its Proposal.

Kemper's Option 1 scored the highest in the Evaluation Matrix. Proposal Option 1 scored 90 points out of a possible 100 points on the Evaluation Matrix. Casper's Proposal Option 1 scored 87 points out of a possible 100 points. The Evaluation Matrix is shown in **Attachment 1**.

The Evaluation Team believes that Kemper has assembled a quality project team with the experience and technical capability to work as a partner with the HCIA to efficiently and effectively provide the services sought under the RFP.

Accordingly, the Evaluation Team recommends that Hudson County Improvement Authority Board of Commissioners award the Qualified Management Contract to Kemper under its proposal Option 1.

As noted, the RFP also required that Respondents provide proposals without Maintenance Services (proposal Option 2). Based upon the total Annual Contract Payments proposed by both Kemper and Casper under proposal Option 1 (including Maintenance Services) were only slightly higher than the Annual Contract Payments proposed by both firms under proposal Option 2. For this reason, proposal Option 2 was viewed as less advantageous by the Evaluation Team, and therefore was not selected.

Attachment 1 - Proposal Evaluation Matrix

Hudson County Improvement Authority Lincoln Park West Golf Course Management RFP Proposal Evaluation Matrix			Phase I – RFP Requirements Checklist Phase II – Proposal Evaluation Phase III – Short List Evaluation			
Phase II	Evaluation Criterion	Weighting	Proposers			
			Kemper		Casper	
			Option 1	Option 2	Option 1	Option 2
Financial Benefits (30)	Total Annual Contract Payment (Note 1)	20	19	19	20	20
	Coordination of Construction Activities	5	4	4	2	2
	Annual Incentive Payment	5	1	1	2	2
Technical / Approach (10)	Project Team Approach	10	9	4	10	5
Proposer Experience (30)	Project Management	6	5	5	5	5
	Contractor Expertise	9	9	9	7	7
	Project Experience	9	9	9	9	9
	New Jersey Experience	6	6	6	6	6
Financial Strength (20)	Financial Capability / Strength of Provider	20	18	18	18	18
Total Phase II		90	80	75	79	74
ALL Respondents that submit complete proposals will be required to take part in interview that will be scored in a 10 point basis						
Phase III	Evaluation Criterion	Weighting	Proposers			
			Kemper		Casper	
			Option 1	Option 2	Option 1	Option 2
Oral Interview Evaluation (10)	Presentation	2	2	2	2	2
	Explanation of Key Factors	3	3	3	2	2
	Understanding of services Requested	5	5	5	4	4
Total Phase III		10	10	10	8	8
Total Phase II and III		100	90	85	87	82

Note 1 – The difference between the Total Annual Contract proposal pricing offered by Casper was approximately 3% lower than the pricing proposed by Kemper. For this reason 3% of the available points in this category were deducted from Kemper.

Attachment 1 - Monthly Breakdown of Total Annual Contract Payments and Coordination of Construction Activities Fee

EVALUATION REPORT

**Proposals Received on July 9, 2013 in Response to
Request for Proposals for Operation and
Management of a Public Nine-Hole Golf Course at
Lincoln Park West, a Hudson County Park, Located
at the Southwest Corner of the Intersection of US
Routes 1&9 and Duncan Avenue
in the City of Jersey City, County of Hudson,
State of New Jersey**

Prepared for:

Hudson County Improvement Authority

By:

**The Hudson County Improvement Authority
Evaluation Team**

Dated:

August 9, 2013

Evaluation Report Table of Contents

<u>Report Sections</u>	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	2
1. Overview of the RFP	6
2. Responses to RFP	9
3. Proposal Evaluation Matrix	11
4. Financial Benefits and Cost Proposal Evaluation	12
5. Technical /Approach	13
6. Respondents' Experience	14
7. Financial Background	16
8. Oral Interview Evaluation	17
9. Recommendation – Successful Respondent	18
<u>Attachments</u>	
Evaluation Matrix	Att. 1

Executive Summary

This Report is being provided pursuant to the requirements of the competitive contracting provisions of the Local Public Contracts Law (N.J.S.A. 40A:11-4.1.b.(2)). The purpose of the Evaluation Report is to provide the Hudson County Improvement Authority ("HCIA") with an evaluation of proposals received, and to provide a recommendation to the HCIA.

The goal of the HCIA in administering the competitive contracting process is to obtain proposals from qualified firms capable of providing operation and management services, under a five-year contract, for the proposed Lincoln Park West 9-hole golf course that will be environmentally responsible and economically beneficial to Hudson County, its residents and the HCIA. To this end, on May 31, 2013, the HCIA issued a Request for Proposals (RFP), as amended, for a five-year qualified management contract ("Contract") for the operation and management, including Construction Phase Services, by the successful respondent to the RFP (Successful Respondent) for the golf course and related facilities to be constructed at Lincoln Park West ("Golf Course").

The HCIA sought proposals on two mandatory options. Option 1 included operation and management services, including Golf Course Maintenance Services. Option 2 included operation and management services, excluding Golf Course Maintenance Services. Respondents were required to propose on both options. Under both proposal options, Respondents were also required to propose a monthly fee for Construction Phase Services to assist the HCIA during the construction of the Golf Course. In addition, under both options, Respondents were allowed to propose an Annual Incentive Payment that they would be entitled to expressed in the form of a percentage of the Net Revenues in excess of the Annual Operating Budget for the last two years of the Contract term. Under the RFP, the HCIA retains sole discretion to select the option under which the Contract will be awarded.

The RFP contained specific permitting information associated with the Golf Course as well as information related to the on-going rough shaping of the Golf Course. Respondents were also able to review the bid documents associated with the Golf Course construction contract bid that was issued by the HCIA on July 11, 2013.

As set forth in the RFP, the Successful Respondent and the HCIA will enter into a five (5) year Contract under which the HCIA will pay the Successful Respondent to provide certain services in connection with the operation and management of the Golf Course both during and after construction of the Golf Course. This

Contract structure provides the County and the HCIA with a qualified firm capable of expertly assisting in the construction of, managing, operating, maintaining, and promoting the Golf Course.

The RFP also requires the Successful Respondent enter into a First Source Agreement with the HCIA, which will require the Successful Respondent to hire qualified Hudson County residents before offering any position to any out-of-county individuals.

In addition, regardless of the proposal Option that is selected, the HCIA, in consultation with the County, will retain the ability to establish and/or modify all fees charged to the public to utilize the Golf Course.

To evaluate proposals, the HCIA organized an evaluation team comprised of: Norman M. Guerra, Chief Executive Officer of the HCIA; Kurt A. Cherry, Executive Director/CFO of the HCIA; William J. Netchert, Esq., General Counsel to the HCIA; Michael O'Connor, Project Manager of the HCIA; Kenneth L. Jennings Jr., Assistant Division Chief Department of Parks and Community Service, Hudson County; ier Ryan J. Scerbo, Esq., of DeCotiis, FitzPatrick & Cole, LLP, Michael Cohen, Paulus, Sokolowski and Sartor, LLC, and Dennis Enright, NW Financial (collectively, Evaluation Team). The Evaluation Team assisted in developing and implementing the RFP, administered the procurement process, conducted oral interviews and drafted this Evaluation Report for the HCIA.

The procurement and evaluation process was undertaken in accordance with the competitive contracting provisions of the Local Public Contracts Law (specifically N.J.S.A. 40A:11-4.1.b.(2), and all other applicable law.

The HCIA received two proposals to the RFP, one from Kemper Sports Management, Inc. (Kemper) and one from Billy Casper Golf, LLC (Casper).

The Evaluation Team conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the proposals submitted by Kemper and Casper based upon price and other factors, as set forth in detail in this Evaluation Report. The Evaluation Team conducted an interview with each Respondent as part of the evaluation process.

The evaluation of each proposal was conducted in accordance with an evaluation matrix (Evaluation Matrix) that is based on a total potential score of 100. The proposals were evaluated based upon the following criteria and weighting factors:

Financial Benefits (30)

Total Annual Contract Payment

Coordination of Construction Activities

	Annual Incentive Payment
Technical Design/Approach (10)	Project Team Approach
Respondent Experience (30)	Project Management Contractor Expertise Project Experience New Jersey Experience
Financial Strength (20)	Financial Capability/Strength of Provider
Oral Interview Evaluation (10)	Presentation Explanation Key Factors Understanding Financial Factors/SREC Market

After reviewing each proposal and conducting an interview, the Evaluation Team scored the proposals in accordance with the established criteria above. The chart below summarizes the scores each proposal received:

Proposer	Option	Score
Kemper Sports Management, Inc.	1 (with Maintenance Services)	90
Kemper Sports Management, Inc.	2 (without Maintenance Services)	85
Billy Casper Golf, LLC	1 (with Maintenance Services)	87
Billy Casper Golf, LLC	2 (without Maintenance Services)	82

Summary of Benefits

The objectives of the HCIA's RFP are to contract with a firm qualified and capable of providing operation and management services, under a five (5) year contract, for the Golf Course in a manner that will provide the residents of Hudson County and the rest of the public with an affordable and unique recreational opportunity currently absent from the County.

The basic terms of Kemper's and Casper's proposals are set forth in detail in **Tables 1 and 2** on pages 9 and 10 of this Report.

All of the proposals received by the HCIA will allow the County and the HCIA to realize the following benefits:

1. Obtain Construction Phase Services from a firm qualified and experienced in the development of golf courses.
2. Obtain operation and management services for a set fee for multiple years.
3. Provide the public with an exceptional golfing experience and provide opportunities to expand public interest in golfing.
4. Monitor the year-to-year use of the Golf Course and utilize programs intended to retain repeat golfers and draw new golfers.

Overview of the RFP

On May 31, 2013, the HCIA issued an RFP for a Contract to be entered into by and between the HCIA and a Successful Respondent under which the successful respondent would be responsible for the operation and management of the Golf Course. The RFP provided for two proposal options. Respondents were required to propose on both Options. Option 1 included operation and management services, including Golf Course Maintenance Services, and Construction Phase Services. Option 2 included operation and management services, and Construction Phase Services, but excluding Golf Course Maintenance Services. In addition all Respondents were allowed to propose an Annual Incentive Payment that they would be entitled to expressed in the form of a percentage of the Net Revenues in excess of the Annual Operating Budget for the last two years of the Contract term. Under the RFP, the HCIA retains sole discretion to select the option under which the Contract will be awarded.

The Successful Respondent and the HCIA will enter into a Contract for five (5) years, the maximum duration permitted by State law, under which the HCIA will compensate the Successful Respondent for operation and management services on annual basis as well as fund the operating budgets for the Golf Course.

Proposals were to be evaluated on the basis of price and non-price criteria, in accordance with competitive contracting provisions of the Public School Contracts Law (N.J.S.A. 40A:11-4.1 et seq.), and applicable law.

Components of the RFP are summarized as follows:

The Golf Course

At 273 acres, Lincoln Park is the largest of the eight parks under the supervision of the Hudson County Division of Parks. Designed by landscape architects Daniel W. Langton and Charles N. Lowrie, Lincoln Park opened in 1907.

Lincoln Park is divided into Lincoln Park East and Lincoln Park West. Lincoln Park West consists of 169 acres located at the southwest corner of the intersection of US Routes 1&9 and Duncan Avenue in Jersey City. Lincoln Park West has frontage along the Hackensack River.

A 65-acre section of Lincoln Park West (the "Golf Course Site") is being redeveloped though the completion of a Landfill Closure and the construction of a 9-hole public golf course project being undertaken by the Authority. Approximately 40 acres of the Golf Course Site have been classified by NJDEP as a former landfill, with the remaining 25 acres classified as non-landfill. The entire

area will be capped with a sand cover material -- previously supplied and stockpiled on site -- that will serve as the base for construction of the 9-hole golf course. Capping of the landfill will be completed in accordance with the NJDEP Landfill Closure Approval.

The Golf Course Site, as part of Lincoln Park, is owned by the County. The County has leased the Golf Course Site to the Authority and has designated the Authority to undertake certain activities on the Site. To this end, the Authority has completed the golf course design and has prepared the Golf Course Site for construction by completing the rough grading and installation of certain deep drainage facilities. The HCIA is currently in the process of seeking bids for the final grading and construction of the Golf Course.

Pricing Proposal

The RFP requested that Respondents provide the following:

Option 1 – Respondents were required to propose a Total Annual Contract Payment for each contract year under the Qualified Management Contract, **including** all Maintenance Services for the Golf Course.

Option 2 – Respondents were required to propose a Total Annual Contract Payment for each contract year under the Qualified Management Contract, **excluding** all Maintenance Services for the Golf Course.

Under both Options 1 and 2 all Respondents were required to propose a Total Monthly Contract Payment for Coordination of Construction Activities Services.

Respondent were permitted, but not required, to propose a percentage of the Net Revenue in excess of the Annual Operating Budget it would like to receive as an Annual Incentive Payment under the Contract beginning in contract year 4.

Scope of Golf Course Management Services

The RFP provided a Scope of Golf Course Management Services (Appendix A-4) to inform Respondents about what services they would be required to provide to the HCIA under the Contract.

The RFP also requires the Successful Respondent enter into a First Source Agreement with the HCIA, which will require the Successful Respondent to hire qualified Hudson County residents before offering any position to any out-of-county individuals.

In addition, regardless of the proposal Option that is selected, the HCIA, in consultation with the County, will retain the ability to establish and/or modify all fees charged to the public to utilize the Golf Course.

Form of Proposals and Required Forms

Proposals were required to include the following information about each Respondent:

- Respondent History/Qualifications; and
- Financial Qualifications.

Proposals were also required to include the following:

- Proposal Pricing Information specified in Appendix C of the RFP.
- Bonding requirements consistent with Article 4 of this RFP.
- Insurance Requirements consistent with Section 4.5 of the RFP.

Proposals must also include the following documents:

- i. New Jersey Business Registration Certificate
- ii. Non-Collusion Affidavit
- iii. Ownership Disclosure Statement
- iv. Affirmative Action Compliance
- v. Consent of Surety
- vi. Proposal Security
- vii. Acknowledgement of Receipt of Addenda
- viii. Consent to Investigation
- ix. Proposal Checklist

Evaluation Process

To evaluate the proposals, the HCIA organized the Evaluation Team and developed an Evaluation Matrix prior to the issuance of the RFP. The Evaluation Matrix includes a three-part process:

- Phase I (legal compliance) is a checklist to determine if the Respondent has included all documentation and information in its Proposal required by the RFP. Once all requirements have been satisfied, a Respondent qualifies to move to Phase II of the evaluation.

-
- Phase II is a weighted rating of the value provided by the proposal across several categories (financial benefits, technical / approach, proposer experience and financial strength) and evaluation of factors within those categories.
 - Phase III is an oral interview of qualified Respondents and the final step in the evaluation process.

The Respondent with the top ranking in Phases II and III will be recommended for award as the Successful Respondent.

2. Responses to RFP

The HCIA received two proposals to the RFP, one from Kemper and one from Casper.

The proposals provided all of the necessary documentation as required of Respondents by the RFP¹.

Tables 1 and 2 provide an overview of the proposals that were submitted to the HCIA.

Table 1: Kemper Overview of Received Proposal

Respondent	RFP Options	Monthly Construction Phase Services	Annual Contract Payments	Annual Incentive Payment
Kemper	Option 1 (with Maintenance Services)	\$14,000/ month*	**Contract Years 1 through 5 \$491,716	Contract Year 4 15% Contract Year 5 15%
Kemper	Option 2 (without Maintenance Services)	\$14,000/ month*	***Contract Years 1 through 5 \$404,716	Contract Year 4 15% Contract Year 5 15%

*This figure represents an average monthly cost which could vary over the course of the construction effort. During the interview process it was clarified to both Casper and Kemper that the HCIA was seeking a full-time individual to be on-site during construction of the Golf Course.

**These fees are based upon a 60 month contract term consisting approximately of 11 months of Construction Phase Services, 9 months of grow-in of the Golf Course and 40 months of operation and management of the Golf Course.

*** This fee was determined by subtracting the proposed fee under Option 2 from the clarified fee provided under Option 1.

¹ Each proposal contained some minor errors and omissions which were identified and clarified during the interview process.

Table 2: Casper Overview of Received Proposal

Respondent	RFP Options	Monthly Construction Phase Services	Annual Contract Payments	Annual Incentive Payment
Casper	Option 1 (with Maintenance Services)	\$ 11,000/ month*	**Contract Year 1 through 5: \$476,500	Contract Year 4 10% Contract Year 5 10%
Casper	Option 2 (without Maintenance Services)	\$ 11,000/ month*	***Contract Year 1 through 5: \$429,500	Contract Year 4 10% Contract Year 5 10%

*Casper's original proposal submission indicated a Monthly Construction Phase Services Fee of \$1,500. However, during the interview process it was clarified to both Casper and Kemper that the HCIA was seeking a full-time individual to be on-site during construction of the Golf Course. Based upon this information Casper clarified its proposal to reflect the fee noted above.

**These fees are based upon a 60 month contract term consisting approximately of 11 months of Construction Phase Services, 9 months of grow-in of the Golf Course and 40 months of operation and management of the Golf Course.

*** This fee was determined by subtracting the proposed fee under Option 2 from the clarified fee provided under Option 1.

3. Proposal Evaluation Matrix

Kemper's and Casper's proposals proceeded to Phase II and III evaluations in accordance with the process defined in the RFP. The evaluation was conducted pursuant to the Evaluation Matrix, which is based on a total potential score of 100. The Evaluation Matrix is broken into the following criteria and weighting factors

Financial Benefits (30)	Total Annual Contract Payment Coordination of Construction Activities Annual Incentive Payment
Technical Design/Approach (10)	Project Team Approach
Respondent Experience (30)	Project Management Contractor Expertise Project Experience New Jersey Experience
Financial Strength (20)	Financial Capability/Strength of Provider
Oral Interview Evaluation (10)	Presentation Explanation Key Factors Understanding of Services Requested

The Evaluation Matrix scoring is provided in **Attachment 1**. The following sections of this Evaluation Report provide a review of the evaluation criteria with respect to the proposals received.

4. Financial Benefits and Cost Proposal Evaluation

Below is a summary of the financial benefits upon which each proposal was evaluated. The Proposals were awarded points in the Evaluation Matrix based on the Respondent's responses to the following criteria:

- Total Annual Contract Payment
- Coordination of Construction Activities
- Annual Incentive Payment

The Evaluation Team carefully considered the fees proposed by each Respondent. During the interview process it became apparent the HCIA would be able to more thoroughly evaluate the fee proposals if it would view the proposed fees on a monthly basis over the term of the five (5) year Contract. The Evaluation Team sought and received from each Respondent a clarification of their fee proposals broken down over a monthly schedule established by the HCIA. One of the clarifications that the Evaluation Team requested from each Respondent was a breakdown of their Total Annual Contract Payments on a monthly basis along with their Coordination of Construction Activities monthly fee. These breakdowns are attached hereto as **Attachment 2**.

Kemper proposed a Total Annual Contract Payment that was approximately 3% higher than that proposed by Casper. Casper was awarded the maximum number of point under this criterion (20) and Kemper was awarded 19 points (3% less then Casper).

With respect to the criterion of Coordination of Construction activities, the Evaluation Team considered not only the fee proposed by a Respondent for Construction Phase Services but also the Respondent's demonstrated ability to provide such services in an efficient and exemplary manner. Although Casper's proposed fee for Construction Phase services was lower than Kemper's fee, Kemper demonstrated a greater degree of ability to provide the services necessary to the HCIA during the construction of the Golf Course. For this reason Kemper was awarded 4 out of 5 points under this criterion and Casper was awarded 2 out of 5 points.

Both firms proposed an Annual Incentive Payment that they would be entitled to, expressed as a percentage of the Net Revenues in excess of the Annual Operating Budget for the last two years of the Contract term. Casper proposed 10% and Kemper proposed 15%. Kemper was awarded 1 out of 5 points for this criterion and Casper received 2 out of 5 points.

5. Technical /Approach

The evaluation of technical/approach has several elements including schedules, project team approach and operation and maintenance plans.

Project Team Approach

Each Respondent demonstrated a highly skilled team of professionals capable of providing the services requested under the RFP in a coordinated and cost effective manner. Casper provided a detailed overview during its interview of the methods and technology it utilizes at other municipal/county owned courses to attract and retain golfers as well as increase bookings of tee-times during lulls in play. The marketing and technology aspects of Casper's presentation were impressive. Kemper also indicated that it employs similar methods to retain and gain golfers, however less detail was offered by Kemper during its interview. Based upon Casper's more detailed explanation of its approach to managing the use of the Golf Course, Casper was awarded the maximum number of points under this criterion (10) and Kemper was awarded 9 out of 10 points.

6. Respondent's Experience

Kemper and Casper were evaluated on experience, which includes the following elements:

- Project Management;
- Contractor Expertise;
- Project Experience; and
- New Jersey Experience.

Kemper has assembled an experienced and qualified project team. Firm qualifications, project experience and references were provided for Kemper and its team members.

Similarly, Casper has assembled an experienced and well qualified project team. Firm qualifications, project experience and references were provided for Casper and its team members.

Both firms were awarded 9 points under this criterion.

Project Management

Both Kemper and Casper assembled teams that have extensive experience in the management and operation of government owned golf courses. Both firms were awarded 5 points under this criterion.

Contractor Expertise

Both firms provided information in their respective proposals that clearly indicated their experience and ability to work with contractors during the construction of a golf course.

However, during the interview process, Kemper's team provided significant insight into the construction process and was better able to explain how and when it would be interacting with the various contractors that will be involved in the construction of the Golf Course when providing the HCIA with Construction Phase Services. Kemper was awarded 9 points and Casper was awarded 7 points under this criterion.

Project Experience

Both firms demonstrated an equal amount of experience and ability in the operation and management of public golf courses in locations across the United States. Both firms were awarded 9 points under this criterion.

New Jersey Experience

Kemper and Casper both have significant involvement with several New Jersey golf courses. For example, Kemper has been a part of the recent course improvements and club house construction at the nearby Galloping Hill Golf Course facility in Kenilworth, New Jersey. Likewise, Casper currently operates one of Morris County's more popular courses: Berkshire Valley in Oak Ridge, New Jersey. Based on both team's significant New Jersey experience, they were each awarded the maximum number of points in this category.

7. Financial Background

Financial Capability/Strength of Respondent

An evaluation of the financial strength of Respondents was undertaken by the HCIA's financial advisor.

Section 3.11 of the RFP required each respondent to provide the HCIA with following statements for the current fiscal year-to-date and the prior fiscal year: (i) balance statement detailing cash and cash equivalents, detailing current assets, current liabilities, stockholder equity, (ii) statement of operations detailing pre-tax earnings, and (iii) statement of cash flows.

Each Respondent provided the necessary information to the HCIA and answered subsequent questions generated by a review of the submitted material both during the interview process and after. Each firm was cooperative and responsive.

Based upon a review of the materials provided by each Respondent, each firm appears to be in equally acceptable financial positions. As such each Respondent was awarded 18 out of 20 points under this criterion.

8. Oral Interview Evaluation

Both Respondents were evaluated with respect to their presentation and answers to questions asked during the interview. This included an evaluation of each Respondent's presentation, explanation of key factors and understanding of financial factors.

Kemper Oral Interview Summary:

Kemper did an excellent job during its presentation, was able to explain key issues, and demonstrated an understanding of financial issues. Kemper brought

Kemper confirmed that it would have no issue utilizing the form of Qualified Management Contract included in the RFP. The following items were also noted and/or clarified during the oral interview:

1. Kemper attended the interview with a full complement of personnel including the firm's CFO.
2. Kemper provided a detailed presentation which detailed their background and experience in managing and operating public golf courses.
3. Kemper provided a detailed discussion concerning the special issues that can arise with the construction and grow-in of a new golf course.
4. Kemper agreed to communicate with the HCIA's financial advisor post interview to discuss Kemper's financial documents further.
5. Kemper agreed to clarify its proposed fees based upon the understanding that the HCIA will require a representative to be on-site at the Golf Course full-time during construction.
6. Kemper subsequently provided clarification concerning its fee proposal and monthly breakdown of its fees.

Casper Oral Interview Summary:

Casper also did an excellent job during its presentation, was able to explain key issues, and demonstrated an understanding of key technical and financial issues.

Casper also confirmed that it would have no issue utilizing the form of Qualified Management Contract included in the RFP. The following items were also noted and/or clarified during the oral interview:

1. Casper attended the meeting with several members its firm who were more than capable of addressing the questions of the Evaluation Team.
2. Casper provided a presentation to the Evaluation Team and then fielded questions from the Team.

-
3. Casper's presentation contained detailed information related to the methods and technology Casper employs to retain and gain golfers as well fill underutilized tee-time.
 4. Casper agreed to communicate with the HCIA's financial advisor post interview to discuss Casper's financial documents further.
 5. Casper agreed to clarify its proposed fees based upon the understanding that the HCIA will require a representative to be on-site at the Golf Course full-time during construction.
 6. Casper subsequently provided clarification concerning its fee proposal and monthly breakdown of its fees.

Because Kemper was able to provide a more detailed explanation of the key factors affecting the construction and initial operation of a new golf course and demonstrated a greater understanding of the services requested under the RFP during its interview with the HCIA, Kemper was awarded the maximum number of points for its interview and Casper was awarded 8 out of 10 points under this criterion.

Recommendation – Successful Respondent

In recommending that a Contract be awarded to Kemper as the Successful Respondent, the Evaluation Team reviewed Kemper's proposal for legal compliance, as well as technical, experience, qualifications and financial strength requirements set forth by the RFP. The Evaluation Team also conducted an interview allowing Kemper to present and clarify its Proposal.

Kemper's Option 1 scored the highest in the Evaluation Matrix. Proposal Option 1 scored 90 points out of a possible 100 points on the Evaluation Matrix. Casper's Proposal Option 1 scored 87 points out of a possible 100 points. The Evaluation Matrix is shown in **Attachment 1**.

The Evaluation Team believes that Kemper has assembled a quality project team with the experience and technical capability to work as a partner with the HCIA to efficiently and effectively provide the services sought under the RFP.

Accordingly, the Evaluation Team recommends that Hudson County Improvement Authority Board of Commissioners award the Qualified Management Contract to Kemper under its proposal Option 1.

As noted, the RFP also required that Respondents provide proposals without Maintenance Services (proposal Option 2). Based upon the total Annual Contract Payments proposed by both Kemper and Casper under proposal Option 1 (including Maintenance Services) were only slightly higher than the Annual Contract Payments proposed by both firms under proposal Option 2. For this reason, proposal Option 2 was viewed as less advantageous by the Evaluation Team, and therefore was not selected.

Attachment 1 - Proposal Evaluation Matrix

Hudson County Improvement Authority Lincoln Park West Golf Course Management RFP Proposal Evaluation Matrix			Phase I – RFP Requirements Checklist Phase II – Proposal Evaluation Phase III – Short List Evaluation			
Phase II	Evaluation Criterion	Weighting	Proposers			
			Kemper		Casper	
			Option 1	Option 2	Option 1	Option 2
Financial Benefits (30)	Total Annual Contract Payment (Note 1)	20	19	19	20	20
	Coordination of Construction Activities	5	4	4	2	2
	Annual Incentive Payment	5	1	1	2	2
Technical / Approach (10)	Project Team Approach	10	9	4	10	5
Proposer Experience (30)	Project Management	6	5	5	5	5
	Contractor Expertise	9	9	9	7	7
	Project Experience	9	9	9	9	9
	New Jersey Experience	6	6	6	6	6
Financial Strength (20)	Financial Capability / Strength of Provider	20	18	18	18	18
Total Phase II		90	80	75	79	74
ALL Respondents that submit complete proposals will be required to take part in interview that will be scored in a 10 point basis						
Phase III	Evaluation Criterion	Weighting	Proposers			
			Kemper		Casper	
			Option 1	Option 2	Option 1	Option 2
Oral Interview Evaluation (10)	Presentation	2	2	2	2	2
	Explanation of Key Factors	3	3	3	2	2
	Understanding of services Requested	5	5	5	4	4
Total Phase III		10	10	10	8	8
Total Phase II and III		100	90	85	87	82

Note 1 – The difference between the Total Annual Contract proposal pricing offered by Casper was approximately 3% lower than the pricing proposed by Kemper. For this reason 3% of the available points in this category were deducted from Kemper.

Attachment 2 - Monthly Breakdown of Total Annual Contract Payments and Coordination of Construction Activities Fee

Lincoln Park West Golf Course
 Operation/Management Proposals

8/6/2013

Contract Year	ANTICIPATED SCHEDULE				OPERATOR FEES / COMMENTS - KEMPER							
		Construct	Plant and Grow-in	Course Opening and Operation	Construction	KS Revised Construction	Grow-In	KS Revised Grow-in	Operation and Management	KS Revised Operation / Management	Total	KS Revised Total
1	Oct-13				14,000	18,000					14,000	18,000
	Nov-13				14,000	16,000					14,000	16,000
	Dec-13				14,000	4,500					14,000	4,500
	Jan-14				14,000	4,500					14,000	4,500
	Feb-14				14,000	5,000					14,000	5,000
	Mar-14				14,000	10,000					14,000	10,000
	Apr-14				14,000	14,000					14,000	14,000
	May-14				14,000	18,000					14,000	18,000
	Jun-14				14,000	18,000					14,000	18,000
	Jul-14				14,000	18,000					14,000	18,000
Aug-14				14,000	18,000				5,000	14,000	23,000	
Sep-14				14,000	18,000				5,000	14,000	23,000	
2	Oct-14				14,000	18,000			2,083	5,000	16,083	23,000
	Nov-14				14,000	16,000			2,083	5,000	16,083	21,000
	Dec-14						14,000		2,083	5,000	16,083	5,000
	Jan-15						14,000		2,083	5,000	16,083	5,000
	Feb-15						14,000		2,083	5,000	16,083	5,000
	Mar-15						14,000		2,083	5,000	16,083	5,000
	Apr-15						14,000		2,083	5,000	16,083	5,000
	May-15						14,000		2,083	5,000	16,083	5,000
	Jun-15								2,083	5,000	2,083	5,000
	Jul-15								2,083	5,000	2,083	5,000
Aug-15								2,083	6,000	2,083	6,000	
Sep-15								2,083	6,000	2,083	6,000	
3	Oct-15								6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
	Nov-15								6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
	Dec-15								6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
	Jan-16								6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
	Feb-16								6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
	Mar-16								6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
	Apr-16								6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
	May-16								6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
	Jun-16								6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
	Jul-16								6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Aug-16								6,000	6,183	6,000	6,183	
Sep-16								6,000	6,183	6,000	6,183	
4	Oct-16								6,183	6,183	6,183	6,183
	Nov-16								6,183	6,183	6,183	6,183
	Dec-16								6,183	6,183	6,183	6,183
	Jan-17								6,183	6,183	6,183	6,183
	Feb-17								6,183	6,183	6,183	6,183
	Mar-17								6,183	6,183	6,183	6,183
	Apr-17								6,183	6,183	6,183	6,183
	May-17								6,183	6,183	6,183	6,183
	Jun-17								6,183	6,183	6,183	6,183
	Jul-17								6,183	6,183	6,183	6,183
Aug-17								6,183	6,367	6,183	6,367	
Sep-17								6,183	6,367	6,183	6,367	
5	Oct-17								6,350	6,367	6,350	6,367
	Nov-17								6,350	6,367	6,350	6,367
	Dec-17								6,350	6,367	6,350	6,367
	Jan-18								6,350	6,367	6,350	6,367
	Feb-18								6,350	6,367	6,350	6,367
	Mar-18								6,350	6,367	6,350	6,367

Contract Year	Construct	Plant and Grow-in	Course Opening and Operation	Construction	KS Revised Construction	Grow-In	KS Revised Grow-in	Operation and Management	KS Revised Operation / Management	Total	KS Revised Total
Apr-18								6,350	6,367	6,350	6,367
May-18								6,350	6,367	6,350	6,367
Jun-18								6,350	6,367	6,350	6,367
Jul-18								6,350	6,367	6,350	6,367
Aug-18								6,350	6,558	6,350	6,558
Sep-18								6,350	6,558	6,350	6,558
Totals:				196,000	196,000	84,000	0	247,400	295,716	527,400	491,716

KemperSports Comments and Assumptions:

1. Revised spreadsheet reflects KemperSports fees per HCIA "contract year" with term ending September 2018, versus KemperSports' "calendar year" fee structure with term ending December 2017, anticipated by KemperSports' proposal.
2. KemperSports assumes grow-in commences August 2014 and all expenses associated with grow-in, including the golf course superintendent and staff compensation are part of golf course operating budget. These costs are not included in KemperSports' management fee.
3. In addition to hiring the golf course superintendent and maintenance staff in August 2014, KemperSports' operations team will begin working on pre-opening activities, clubhouse move-in, budgeting, business planning, etc.

Lincoln Park West Golf Course
 Operation/Management Proposals

8/6/2013

Contract Year	ANTICIPATED SCHEDULE			OPERATOR FEES/COMMENTS - CASPER					
		Construct	Plant and Grow-in	Course Opening and Operation	Construction	Grow-In	Operation and Management	Total	Comments
1	Oct-13				11,000.00			11,000.00	
					11,000.00			11,000.00	
					11,000.00			11,000.00	
	Jan-14				11,000.00			11,000.00	
					11,000.00			11,000.00	
					11,000.00			11,000.00	
					11,000.00			11,000.00	
	Jun-14				11,000.00			11,000.00	
						3,500.00		3,500.00	
						3,500.00		3,500.00	
Sep-14					3,500.00		3,500.00		
2	Oct-14					3,500.00		3,500.00	
						3,500.00		3,500.00	
						3,500.00		3,500.00	
	Jan-15					3,500.00		3,500.00	
						3,500.00		3,500.00	
						3,500.00		3,500.00	
						3,500.00		3,500.00	
	Jun-15						8,000.00	8,000.00	
							8,000.00	8,000.00	
	Sep-15						8,000.00	8,000.00	
3	Oct-15						8,000.00	8,000.00	
							8,000.00	8,000.00	
	Dec-15						8,000.00	8,000.00	
	Jan-16						8,000.00	8,000.00	
							8,000.00	8,000.00	
							8,000.00	8,000.00	
							8,000.00	8,000.00	
							8,500.00	8,500.00	
							8,500.00	8,500.00	
	Sep-16						8,500.00	8,500.00	
4	Oct-16						8,500.00	8,500.00	
							8,500.00	8,500.00	
							8,500.00	8,500.00	
	Jan-17						8,500.00	8,500.00	
							8,500.00	8,500.00	
							8,500.00	8,500.00	
							8,500.00	8,500.00	
							8,750.00	8,750.00	

Lincoln Park West Golf Course
Operation/Management Proposals

8/6/2013

Contract Year	Construct	Plant and Grow-in	Course Opening and Operation	Construction	Grow-In	Operation and Management	Total	Comments	
						8,750.00	8,750.00		
	Sep-17					8,750.00	8,750.00		
5	Oct-17					8,750.00	8,750.00		
						8,750.00	8,750.00		
						8,750.00	8,750.00		
						8,750.00	8,750.00		
						8,750.00	8,750.00		
						8,750.00	8,750.00		
						8,750.00	8,750.00		
						8,750.00	8,750.00		
						9,000.00	9,000.00		
						9,000.00	9,000.00		
						9,000.00	9,000.00		
		Sep-17					9,000.00	9,000.00	
	Totals:				99,000.00	38,500.00	339,000.00	476,500.00	