



# CITY OF WOOD DALE

## **PUBLIC NOTICE**

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE STATUTES OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS AND THE ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF WOOD DALE, NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE COMMUNITY PARK REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS EVALUATION WORKSHOP TAKES PLACE AT 6:00 P.M. ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2024 IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS OF THE CITY HALL, 404 NORTH WOOD DALE ROAD, WOOD DALE, ILLINOIS, FOR THE PURPOSES SET FORTH IN THE FOLLOWING AGENDAS:

**COMMUNITY PARK REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS EVALUATION WORKSHOP  
OF THE  
CITY OF WOOD DALE, ILLINOIS  
SEPTEMBER 26, 2024  
Council Chambers  
6:00 PM**

- I. Welcome**
- II. Report and Recommendation**
  - a. Staff Presentation
    - i. Review the proposals that were submitted in response to the RFP issued by the City
  - b. Open Discussion – Q & A
  - c. Recommendation
    - i. Determine which firm, if any, should be recommended for approval by the City Council
- III. Adjourn**

**POSTED IN CITY HALL ON SEPTEMBER 20, 2024 AT 4:00 PM**  
LYNN CURIALE, CITY CLERK  
BY: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE



---

## **CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP**

Date: September 26, 2024  
Subject: Community Park Request for Proposals Evaluation  
Staff Contact: Staci Springer, Community Development Director  
Department: Community Development

**TITLE:** Workshop on Community Park Request for Proposals Evaluation

### **OVERVIEW:**

In 2013, the City adopted the “Wood Dale Vision Plan” which contained ideas for improving the traditional central business district centered around the intersection of Irving Park and Wood Dale Roads. One of the major components of the plan is a proposed community park to be constructed on vacant City-owned property northwest of the intersection. According to the Vision Plan, the park could include a fully enclosed or open pavilion for hosting events, a public garden, festival grounds / open lawn, adventure playground, country barn & home, and possible recreational trail connections.

The Vision Plan was intended to serve as an official decision-making guide for physical development over approximately ten years. The motivation for this long-range planning effort was a perceived lack of identity and sense of place in the City’s central business district. Several plan elements have already been implemented, such as the Clock Tower and the Wood Dale and Irving Park intersection safety improvements. However, the design of the community park component had not moved forward as the City was awaiting completion of the new Public Works facility and the subsequent demolition of the remote Public Works building on Commercial. Other factors included a lack of funding and focusing staff efforts on securing a development for the former SBT property south of City Hall. Now that all three of those items are in various stages of completion, focus has shifted toward the design and construction of Community Park.

Since over 10 years have passed from the creation of the Vision Plan, it was deemed appropriate to revisit the proposed design of the park and determine what elements are best suited for the community at this time. Towards the end of 2023 and in early 2024, the Streetscape and Economic Enhancement Committee (Streetscape) reviewed the Vision Plan to consider what elements should continue to be featured in the Park, which

ones were of less importance, and to brainstorm new ideas. For example, several new ideas included a bandshell with sunken plaza, fully outdoor pavilion, and on-site parking. Ultimately, the pavilion, playground, gardens, and festival grounds (open lawn) were identified as desirable, while relocating the existing historic barn and/or home in coordination with the Wood Dale Historical Society was seen as the least important element and one which could be considered for elimination entirely due to a lack of feasibility. It was also determined that the most efficient path forward would be to engage a landscape architecture team to re-evaluate the elements and finalize a layout and phasing plan for the park.

In June 2024, staff prepared a Request for Proposals (RFP) for consultant services to prepare a 'Community Park Master Site Plan and Architectural Design of Park Features' and presented the draft to the PZB Committee. Following PZB direction, the RFP was issued on July 2, 2024, and provided a detailed description of the City's need for a "Town Center" or central gathering space for recreation and special events. The RFP directs respondents to incorporate key park elements previously identified in the 2013 Vision Plan, which were recently reviewed by the Streetscape Committee and PZB Committee, such as a pavilion / bandshell, playground, walking paths, and landscaping.

The RFP was sent directly to five (5) experienced professional consulting firms known for the preparation of park plans and civic public spaces in the Chicagoland area. The RFP was also posted publicly on the City of Wood Dale website which garnered additional interest and two (2) additional proposals. Proposals were to be submitted no later than August 2, 2024. The City received 7 proposals by the deadline.

### **BACKGROUND:**

The following 7 teams submitted proposals:

1. Hitchcock Design Group (with Dewberry Architects)
2. HR Green
3. Upland Design (with Legat Architects)
4. Confluence
5. MKSK (with Booth Hansen Architects)
6. Fehr Graham (they have Architects in house)
7. The Lakota Group (with Williams Architects)

All of the proposals can be found at the following Dropbox link:

[https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/3udx2784keylzf8f30p96/AKV\\_9mzOGYvE7I\\_49dGggiM?rlkey=8xwt670d4lc8507tx9ruj26wx&st=7y66shvg&dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/3udx2784keylzf8f30p96/AKV_9mzOGYvE7I_49dGggiM?rlkey=8xwt670d4lc8507tx9ruj26wx&st=7y66shvg&dl=0)

### **Evaluation Methodology**

Each firm was evaluated according to the following five (5) broad metrics:

1. Application Completeness
2. Application Quality (Weighted Ranking)
3. Proposal Evaluation Criteria
4. Pro/Con Lists
5. Reference Checks

The above expectations and evaluation criteria were communicated to the recipients upfront within the RFP to ensure transparency and fairness.

*1) Application Completeness*

Staff performed a thorough review of all proposals to determine the completeness of each proposal (see Attachment A – Conformance with RFP Evaluation). The application completeness evaluated if the proposal included all the components that were requested in the RFP including a transmittal letter, work plan, work examples, etc. The proposed total fees ranged from \$39,500 to \$56,500 (see Attachment B – Total Project Fee).

*2) Application Quality*

Staff designed a weighted evaluation spreadsheet to evaluate the application quality based on the eight (8) objective criteria listed in the RFP. Points were assigned to each of the criteria based on the importance of each element. Staff individually assigned a score of 1 to 5 for each plan component. All staff scores were then averaged together, ranking the proposals from most to least preferable (see Attachment C – Proposal Evaluation Spreadsheet).

The final scoring of the proposals resulted in a point total between 5 (best possible score) and 35 (worst possible score). Following the evaluation, the ranking of the proposals was as listed below.

1. Upland Design (6 points)
2. HR Green (15 points)
3. MKSK (18 points)
4. Confluence (19 points)
5. Hitchcock Design Group (24 points)
6. The Lakota Group (28 points)
7. Fehr Graham (30 points)

As can be seen from the above final rankings, there was one (1) firm at the top of the list with a near perfect score of five (5) points, 3 firms grouped together in the middle, and three (3) firms trailing near the bottom.

*3) Proposal Evaluation Criteria*

Staff then met collectively to discuss the quality of each proposal in more depth to further refine the rankings. A separate set of consultant selection criteria listed in the RFP was used to investigate the nuances of each proposal. The quality of each response was measured according to the firm's understanding of the City's expectations, experience with similar projects, and team composition. Other aspects considered were the firm's ability to complete projects on-schedule and within budget, competence in managing projects, and experience working with units of local government. The results of this review reinforced the ranking above.

#### 4) *Pro/Con List*

In addition to the scoring evaluation, staff prepared a pro/con list for each consultant's proposal (see Attachment E – Pro/Con List). The purpose of the pro/con list was to provide a quick summary of items that stood out for each proposal. Pro/cons were organized in a table format allowing comparison of the pros, or potential positive outcomes/ideas, against the cons, or items with potential negative outcome/ideas.

#### 5) *Reference Checks*

Staff performed reference checks for the top three (3) ranked firms. In total, staff was able to reach 14 references in total for the three (3) firms. Feedback for all three (3) firms was very positive overall, suggesting that all top firms are well-respected in the industry and have a proven track record of success. A summary of the reference checks is provided below:

##### **Upland Design**

- Responses overwhelmingly positive
- Respondents praised ability to stay on budget, communication, and delivery of meaningful results.
- Consistently met or exceeded expectations
- Would be hired again by all references.

##### **HR Green**

- References generally positive
- All references were for mainly engineering projects (or the engineering portions of projects), which is the firm's area of expertise
- Respondents emphasized responsiveness and ability to stay on budget
- Would be hired again by all references

##### **MKSK**

- Responses very positive
- Respondents described them as reliable and creative
- Handled projects effectively under difficult circumstances
- Would be hired again by all references

##### **Project Budget**

In previous years, the Community Park project remained unfunded due to the large expense. During budget discussions earlier this year, it was decided that \$25,000 would be allocated in the Capital Plan for the project in FY2025. If expenses exceeded this amount, additional funds would be allocated. For future years the following funds have been reserved in the Capital Plan: \$50,000 in FY26, \$50,000 in FY27, and \$1,000,000 in FY28. These numbers can be adjusted as needed in the coming budget cycles. It is anticipated that the project will be constructed in phases over a 2-3 year construction timeline, as resources become available.

## **Upland Design**

As mentioned above, the firm rankings resulted in three (3) groupings, one (1) at the top, three (3) in the middle, and three (3) toward the bottom. Since one (1) proposal ranked higher than the others, staff is providing a short overview that firm's proposal below.

According to the RFP response, Upland Design Ltd was established 26 years ago with a focus on creating great spaces for communities to go outside. Their work includes pedestrian spaces, streetscapes, plazas, park development and renovation, community wide recreation and park planning, playgrounds, campus spaces, and natural areas along with connections to indoor spaces. The firm is comprised of 25 design professionals between offices in Chicago and Plainfield, including specialists in landscape architecture, horticulture, construction administration, and administrative support.

Upland Design is partnering with Legat Architects who are also well known for working on public projects. Both firms are well known and respected in the industry. The Project Team for Wood Dale's Community Park project would include four (4) highly qualified and experienced individuals with two (2) landscape architects from Upland Design and two (2) architects from Legat Architects. Upland Design and Legat Architects also worked together on another project, an amphitheater for the Buffalo Grove Park District. Therefore, they have a prior history of working together successfully.

The Upland Team provided impressive past project examples that highlighted their experience designing similar parks and community gathering places for other government agencies. They provided a long list of grants they obtained for other agencies. Their Project Scope & Work Plan was organized and well thought out, providing a clear and thorough project methodology and approach. They were the only firm that specified they would both provide site renderings and 3D drawings of the playground for all three (3) preliminary concept plans. Most others reserved these types of enhancements for just the final selected Master Plan. Their proposal was complete and fully customized for Wood Dale while many of the other firms used a significant amount of stock information and standard firm language in their proposals.

As a Chicago-based firm, Upland emphasized their familiarity with the Chicagoland area and the unique challenges and opportunities that brings. The firm proposed an optional public Open House to gain input from the community on the design alternatives. The Upland Team noted the importance of offering a public input opportunity as many grant applications require such. They also indicated they would prepare the site plans with the grant applications in mind so Wood Dale would rate highly on the grant evaluations. Grant writing and preparation of construction documents were not included in the scope (similar to many of the other proposals), however Upland Design has indicated a willingness to support the City in these areas in a future phase, if desired.

**Innovative Ideas**

The firms were all notified that their proposals became the property of the City upon submission in the RFP. One of the addendums to the RFP also restated that fact that anything included in the in the proposal became the property of the City upon submission. Since all the firms proposed one or more creative or innovative ideas, staff compiled a list of the ideas which can be found in Attachment D – Innovative Ideas.

Some ideas represent potential physical park elements, such as a temporary winter ice skating rink, on-site restrooms, and a small, prefabricated barn event space, while others represent changes to the plan implementation methodology. For example, several firms highlighted their intention to conduct community engagement by hosting a design charette, stakeholder meetings, or an open house to invite the public to offer input.

**STREETSCAPE COMMITTEE:**

The Streetscape and Economic Enhancement Committee (Streetscape) reviewed the seven (7) proposals for Community Park on September 9 and unanimously recommended Upland Design as the preferred consultant. The Streetscape Committee was also asked to review the innovative ideas and highlight those which may be appropriate to forward to City Council for further consideration and possible incorporation into the final proposal and design (these are highlighted in yellow in Attachment D).

**REQUESTED STAFF DIRECTION:**

The purpose of this workshop is to review the proposal evaluation provided by staff and to review the Streetscape Committee’s recommendations in order to provide staff with direction on which firm shall be taken to the next step, which would involve staff meeting with the project team followed by the drafting of a contract document that would be considered by the PZB on October 10, 2024. The selected consultant would be present at the PZB meeting to make a presentation and answer any questions.

**NEXT STEPS – RFP SCHEDULE:**

The following table outlines the anticipated timeline for RFP proposal submission and selection:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Target Dates</b>
RFP Issued	July 2, 2024
Submission of Questions	July 15, 2024
Submission of Proposals	August 2, 2024
Streetscape Committee Meeting	September 9, 2024
<b>City Council Workshop</b>	<b>September 26, 2024</b>
PZB Committee Meeting	October 10, 2024
City Council Meeting – Contract Approval	October 17, 2024
Professional Services Start	October 18, 2024

**STRATEGIC PLAN ITEM:**

- Yes
- No

**Objective: Provide Exceptional Places – Planning and Development**

Goal to develop a “Town Center” interactive multi-use space and / or building.

**DOCUMENTS ATTACHED**

- ✓ Attachment A – Conformance with RFP Evaluation
- ✓ Attachment B – Total Project Fee
- ✓ Attachment C – Proposal Evaluation Spreadsheet
- ✓ Attachment D – Innovative Ideas
- ✓ Attachment E – Pro/Con List
- ✓ Streetscape Meeting Draft Minutes 09/09/2024



**Wood Dale Community Park Master Site Plan Proposals  
Conformance with RFP Evaluation**

Consultant	Understanding and Approach (Project Proposal)	Work Plan	Experience in Wood Dale	Samples of Relevant Work	Resumes	Staff Availability	Government References (Min. 5)	Project Schedule	Six Month Schedule Met	Grant Writing Included	Fee	Teamed With
Hitchcock Design Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes - 3	Yes	Yes	Yes - 6	Yes	Yes	No - \$6,500 per	\$48,968	Dewberry Architects
HR Green	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes - 3	Yes	Yes	Yes - 5	Yes	Yes	Not Mentioned	\$39,500 (Lump Sum)	
Upland Design and Legat	Yes	Yes	No	Yes - 9	Yes	No	Yes - 5 Each	Yes	Yes	No writing. Just list of grants.	\$50,800	Legat Architects
Confluence	Yes	Yes	No	Yes - 3	Yes	Yes	Yes - 5	Yes	Yes	No	\$48,000	
MKSK	Yes	Yes	No	Yes - 3	Yes	Yes	Yes - 5	Yes	Yes	Not Mentioned	\$49,500	Booth Hansen
Fehr Graham	Yes	Not Really	No	Yes - 3	Yes	Yes	Yes - 5	Yes	Yes	Yes - \$7,500	\$58,300	Has Full Team
The Lakota Group	No	Yes	Yes	Yes - 10 and 3	Yes	No	Yes - On Examples	Yes	Yes	Not Mentioned	\$56,500	Williams Architects

<b>Total Project Fee* Sorted by Rank</b>				
<b>Prime Consultant</b>	<b>Total Hours</b>	<b>Total Fee</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Notes</b>
HR Green		\$39,500	1	Lump Sum
Confluence		\$48,000	2	
Hitchcock Design Group	274	\$48,968	3	
MKSK		\$49,500	4	Incl. Expenses
Upland Design		\$50,800	5	
Fehr Graham		\$50,800	6	Less Topo
The Lakota Group		\$56,500	7	

\*Sorted by Rank

**Proposal Evaluation Spreadsheet  
Wood Dale Community Park Site Design  
Proposals Submitted August 2, 2024**

**Attachment C**

RFP #	Proposal Evaluation Criteria (Listed in RFP)	Consultants/Respondents to RFP						
		Max Points	Hitchcock Design Group	HR Green	Upland Design	Confluence	MKSK	Fehr Graham
2	Letter of Transmittal or Executive Summary (summarizes key points of the proposal and approach to the scope of work)	5						
3	Project Proposal (how approach project including methodology and technical aspects)	20						
4	Work Plan and Schedule (detailed phasing and task list with estimated milestones, meet 6-month timeline)	20						
6	Project Team (strength of resumes and qualifications)	10						
7	Experience on similar projects with reference contact information (preferably projects within the last 3-5 years)	20						
9	References (at least 5 government references for similar projects)	5						
10	Total Fixed Fee	10						
	Above and Beyond (innovative ideas, suggestions of improvements to scope, ways to save costs/time, etc.)	10						
	<b>Total Weighted Score</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	<b>Final Rank (1 is most favorable response, 7 is least favorable response)</b>							

Each Firm is rated 1-5; 5 being the most desirable, 1 being the least desirable  
 Total Score = sum of the (weight x Firm score) /5 (possible points)  
 Maximum point value = 100

<b>Total Weighted Score of all Raters</b>
<b>Total Final Ranks of all Raters (5 - best possible, 35 - worst possible)</b>
<b>Average Ranked Score of all Raters</b>
<b>Ranking Based Upon Average Rater Ranking</b>

226	243	261	226	234	208	215
24	15	6	19	18	30	28
4.8	3	1.2	3.8	3.6	6	5.6
5	2	1	4	3	7	6

## Community Park Proposals - Innovative Ideas

### Innovative Ideas, Suggestions, and Creative Elements

Items highlighted in **yellow** are recommended by Streetscape to be included in the final proposal

#### Confluence

---

##### *Deliverables*

1. Fly through videos
2. Interactive visual preference exercises (see page 4)
3. Public Open House

##### *Design Elements*

4. Overhead wire/bulb lighting over event space (see pages 9, 17 & 19)

#### Fehr Graham

---

##### *Design Elements*

1. Entry Signage with City logo
2. Prefabricated Barn structure small event space
3. Canopy design
4. Perimeter plaza and shade structures
5. Prairie Style Vendor pavilion concept
6. Food truck drive along tracks
7. Bocce ball courts
8. Dual use of field to allow two U6 soccer fields or one U8 soccer field
9. Playground
10. On-site parking lot
11. Drinking water fountain
12. Pavilion for farmers market and community events

#### Hitchcock

---

##### *Deliverables*

1. 3D Graphics

##### *Design Elements*

2. Terraced audience steps – Schaumburg Town Square (or sloped gradually upward as you move away from stage/pavilion) (see page 28)
3. Shade sculptures at Elgin Riverfront (see page 27)
4. Walking loop / trail system
5. Receptables / outlets
6. Native and seasonal plantings
7. Space for community pop-up events

#### HR Green

---

##### *Deliverables*

1. Weekly conference calls

*Design Elements*

2. Dual use ice skating rink in winter

3. Programming – Farmer’s Market, craft fair, live music, festivals, food and beverage events, car shows, flea market/swap meet, food trucks, coffee and concessions.
4. Access to Commercial Street can be closed down for larger events
5. Consider wider plan including Park District for a larger and connected public space
6. Paths extended through the floodplain west of the park and possibly looping along the Salt Creek Corridor (work with Forest Preserve)
7. Heavy landscape screen along Metra tracks and Wood Dale Rd to create intimate space
8. Shelter seating on sides of pavilion, can be rented or used for VIP’s/disabled attendees
9. Promenade along Commercial Street ROW (food trucks, booths, etc.)
10. Art Walk along pathway (with rotating pieces)
11. Public restrooms
12. Monument sign at Wood Dale Rd & Commercial St intersection

**Lakota Group**

---

*Deliverables*

1. 2-3 illustrative renderings of key features or views by watercolor or Sketchup/Lumion

*Design Elements*

2. Harmony Square – pop up ice rink on pavement, pavilion with music note on top (see page 22)
3. Canopies on either side of event structure at Swedish Heritage Park (see page 34)
4. Ambient lighting

**MKSK**

---

*Deliverables*

1. Include maintenance plan
2. Include programming ideas for park
3. Include final bound plan
4. All plans to comply with requirements for applicable grants
5. Public workshop / Open House
6. Final plan to accommodate Wood Dale’s special events schedule

*Design Elements*

7. Bike racks
8. Public restrooms
9. Destination play-space (emphasis on adventure playground)
10. Pollinator gardens (see page 47)

**Upland Design**

---

*Deliverables*

1. Project kick-off site visit with landscape architects and architects

2. Site analysis to include collection of soil boring samples, review of available GIS data, and existing drainage conditions
3. Development of grant chart with timeline to assist with funding (Grant writing assistance is optional)
4. For all 3 preliminary site plans will provide pavilion elevations, color renderings, 3D images of playground and cost estimates
5. Optional public meeting which they suggest is important for grant eligibility
6. Highly organized work plan that includes an extra meeting to review the preliminary master site plan

*Design Elements*

1. Stepped seat walls (see page 12 and 23)
2. Paved area in front of pavilion/stage for tables and/or chairs (see page 13)
3. Pergolas with seat walls (page 19)
4. Native species identification boards (page 20)
5. Drinking fountain with dog bowl

**Staff Ideas**

---

*Design Elements*

1. Use lot at NEC of Grove and Commercial for parking

## Community Park Proposals – Pro/Con Lists

### 1 - Upland Design

<p><i>Pro</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Lots of examples of similar relevant projects in nearby suburban communities</b></li> <li>2. <b>Experienced and qualified staff</b></li> <li>3. <b>Extremely positive feedback from references</b></li> <li>4. <b>Will provide color renderings for all 3 concept plans</b></li> <li>5. <b>Will prepare a grant chart</b></li> <li>6. Cover letter tailored to Wood Dale</li> <li>7. Helpful that they listed project components in all examples</li> <li>8. Concise and easy to read RFP response</li> <li>9. Partnering with Legat Architects, a well-respected firm</li> <li>10. Included both reference list and project examples for architecture team</li> <li>11. Noted total project budget for each project example</li> <li>12. Will provide cost estimates for all 3 preliminary concept plans</li> <li>13. 3D rendering of master plan</li> <li>14. Provided a long list of grants they obtained for other agencies</li> <li>15. Suggested optional public meeting to increase scoring on grant applications</li> <li>16. Included a page on prior Project Challenges and Opportunities showing they are reflective and look to improve</li> </ol>	<p><i>Con</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grant writing is an additional fee</li> <li>2. Did not mention engineering</li> <li>3. Many park district projects, some municipal</li> </ol>
---	---

### 2 - HR Green

<p><i>Pro</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Highly customized proposal for Wood Dale – prepared concept site plan and offered many ideas</li> <li>2. Previous work in Wood Dale (Clock Tower Plaza, Veteran's Park, Elizabeth Drive Bridge and Path,</li> </ol>	<p><i>Con</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Predominantly an engineering firm, not a landscape architecture firm (5 engineers and 1 certified Landscape Architect)</li> <li>2. Not proposing to partner with architecture firm</li> </ol>
---	---

<p>Wood Dale Water Tower, Central/Irving Intersection Design)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Lowest cost option</li> <li>4. Includes grant assistance</li> <li>5. Weekly conference calls</li> <li>6. Has engineers on staff to handle stormwater and engineering issues</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Construction Phasing Plan not included in this project</li> <li>4. 2 of 3 project examples are from Wood Dale, 3rd is a skate park (an engineering project)</li> <li>5. 1 of the references is from Wood Dale, others are for engineering projects</li> <li>6. Lack in civic space/park planning experience</li> </ol>
--	--

**3 - MKSK**

<p><i>Pro</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Implementation plan is well thought out and robust</b></li> <li>2. <b>Provided a long list of project experience</b></li> <li>3. <b>Mentions and recognizes there are topographic opportunities and constraints and the need to address drainage</b></li> <li>4. <b>Mentions all plans will accommodate the City's Special Event Schedule</b></li> <li>5. <b>Experienced in civic space design</b></li> <li>6. Would include maintenance plan and programming ideas for park</li> <li>7. Adds extra plan by mentioning a Draft Concept Design Plan</li> <li>8. Suggests public bathrooms</li> <li>9. Mentions all final plans will comply with requirements for grants</li> <li>10. Will provide a bid/procurement strategy and suggested next steps</li> <li>11. Has 2 certified Landscape Architects, 1 certified Planner, and 2 certified Architects on team</li> <li>12. Nicely bound proposal</li> </ol>	<p><i>Con</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Few examples of similar projects in Illinois (most examples from out of state)</li> <li>2. Examples are very large projects, not similar in scope to our project</li> <li>3. Project example years not listed, but awards date projects to 2012, 2014, 2019 (not in requested 5 year timeframe)</li> <li>4. Would include cost estimates only on final Master Site Plan</li> <li>5. Work Plan is about 50% stock</li> <li>6. No project examples or references for architecture team</li> <li>7. Renderings not included</li> <li>8. Work plan unclear, hard to follow</li> <li>9. Only 6 meetings shown, not full 9 required, but does mention 2 possible stakeholder meetings</li> </ol>
--	--

**4 - Confluence**

<p><i>Pro</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Experience working with municipalities as a client (Village of Streamwood, City of Joliet)</li> <li>2. Emphasis on building town center</li> <li>3. CD image with flythroughs</li> <li>4. Planners on staff</li> </ol>	<p><i>Con</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Over-use of "flowery" language in work plan</li> <li>2. Generic cover letter (stock)</li> <li>3. No dates on examples (needed to be within 5 years)</li> <li>4. Team includes only 2 certified Landscape Architects</li> </ol>
--	--



<p>5. Highly design-oriented language in proposal</p>	<p>5. Did not mention architect or engineer          6. Cost estimate provided for final plan only          7. Did not include 2 of the required meetings from the RFP          8. 8 meetings mentioned, but none are Streetscape or PZB Committee          9. No discussion of deliverables, renderings, 3D images, grant writing, or construction documents</p>
---	---

**5 - Hitchcock**

<p><i>Pro</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Lots of examples of similar projects in nearby suburban communities</b></li> <li>2. <b>Experience designing “Town Center” spaces including pavilions, parks, &amp; plazas</b></li> <li>3. <b>Understands that some engineering will be necessary</b></li> <li>4. <b>Specific and detailed scope of work, well outlined</b></li> <li>5. <b>Team includes 3 certified Landscape Architects and 1 certified Architect</b></li> <li>6. Has done work in the City – Central Park</li> </ol>	<p><i>Con</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Majority of cover letter and Understanding and Approach are generic, not customized to Wood Dale</li> <li>2. 3D graphics cost extra</li> <li>3. Low-quality physical RFP packet</li> <li>4. Staff availability unclear</li> <li>5. Years not listed on examples</li> <li>6. Missing about 3 meetings from RFP</li> <li>7. Examples are ordinary, except for McHenry Shops</li> <li>8. All public input meetings are extra cost</li> <li>9. No project examples or references for architecture group</li> </ol>
---	--

**6 - Lakota Group**

<p><i>Pro</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Examples of similar projects in Illinois communities</b></li> <li>2. <b>Design phase would include preparation of 3D models / renderings</b></li> <li>3. <b>Recognizes there are water issues on the site</b></li> <li>4. <b>Has done work in City – Woodlands at White Oaks</b></li> <li>5. <b>Large project team with relevant experience</b></li> <li>6. Would provide cost estimates for all preliminary concept and final plans</li> <li>7. Team includes 3 certified Landscape Architects, 3 certified Architects, and a certified Planner, though it’s not clear who would be working directly on the project</li> </ol>	<p><i>Con</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Generic / stock RFP proposal. Not tailored to Wood Dale</li> <li>2. Renderings and 3D model provided, but only for final plan</li> <li>3. While provided 9 project examples, 7 of 9 were out of the 5-year timeframe</li> <li>4. No references or project examples for architecture team</li> <li>5. Did not follow meeting schedule in RFP; Streetscape and PZB Meetings not shown as separate meetings</li> <li>6. Did not include staff availability</li> </ol>
--	--

7 - Fehr Graham

<p><i>Pro</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Concept site plan provided (Tailored to Wood Dale)</b></li> <li>2. <b>Provided 3D models of example pavilions, signage, &amp; country barn</b></li> <li>3. <b>Proposal understood need for engineering and to look at wetlands</b></li> <li>4. <b>Funding assistance/grant applications included (price \$7500 less without)</b></li> <li>5. <b>Team includes certified Landscape Architect, certified Engineer, Surveyor, Grant Writer</b></li> <li>6. Price is actually \$7500 less due to topo being already completed</li> <li>7. Innovative ideas stood out</li> <li>8. Large staff, ample availability</li> </ol>	<p><i>Con</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project work areas lack innovation and creativity</li> <li>2. Project work examples are smaller scale than what we are looking for</li> <li>3. No mention of design or construction plan, even in 2nd phase</li> <li>4. No mention of phasing the construction of site</li> </ol>
--	---

---

## **STREETSCAPE & ECONOMIC ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES**

Committee Date: Monday, September 9, 2024  
Present: Acting Chairperson Ald. Michael Curiale, Shashwat Baxi,  
Mike Melone, Steve Mikos, Paula Masilotti (arrived 6:35pm)  
Absent: Nick Luciana  
Also Present: Andy Koterias, Planner, Gosia Pociecha, Senior Planner,  
Abby Davis, CD Intern; Ald. Art Woods, Janelle Silva  
Meeting Convened at: 6:30 PM

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Ald. Curiale called the meeting to order at 6:33 pm. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

### **BUSINESS ITEMS:**

#### A. Approval Of the Minutes

Ald. Curiale motioned to approve the minutes of the July 22 meeting, seconded by Ms. Masilotti. The minutes were unanimously approved via voice vote.

#### B. Community Park – Evaluation of RFP Responses

Planner Koterias provided an overview of the meeting objectives; including, the review of the RFP proposal evaluations followed by Streetscape and Economic Enhancement Committee (SEEC) recommendation of the preferred consultant, and second component being the identification by SEEC of innovative ideas that should be added to the scope.

Planner Koterias provided a brief background on the Community Park, beginning with its inception in the 2013 Vision Plan. The intent is to address a perceived lack of identity and sense of place in the city's traditional central business district. The plan originally called for several elements including pavilion, public garden, festival grounds, adventure playground, barn and trail connections. City Council recently gave direction to revisit the plan to update it. Upon direction from the PZB Committee, an RFP was issued to identify a landscape architecture firm to reevaluate the elements of the Vision Plan, as well as prepare a layout and phasing plan. RFP included the City's needs and key park elements originally identified in the Vision Plan and recently reviewed by SEEC. The

---

RFP was sent directly to five (5) consultants known for their experience in park/civic planning and posted on City's website. Seven (7) responses to the RFP were received.

Director Springer described the evaluation process divided into 5 parts: application completeness, application quality (weighted ranking), proposal evaluation criteria, pro/con list, and reference checks. Application completeness included review if consultants submitted everything in their proposal. Application quality was review of each submittal against the proposal evaluation criteria weighted based on importance. Result of the evaluation are the total points, and the consultants were ranked based on the total points received. The top 3 consultants were close in points, with the remaining 4 trailing behind.

Overview of proposals was also provided including which consultants included grant funding assistance, preparation of construction drawings, 2 firms prepared site specific concept plans for Wood Dale, 3 firms had prior experience working with Wood Dale, all 7 met the 6-month timeframe and 5 out of 7 included architects on their design teams. The evaluation resulted in ranking of the firms from 1 to 7. In addition, pro/con lists were prepared for each consultant. Director Springer went through pro/cons for each consultant focusing on the top 5 pros for each consultant and all cons. Upland stood out with the significant number of pros. HR Green presented a highly customized proposal for Wood Dale and has experience working with the City. However, they are a predominantly engineering firm and did not indicate an architect they would partner with. Also, 2 of the 3 examples provided by HR Green were from City projects and other examples showed emphasis on engineering (skate park design) not civic park design. A question was raised who worked with HR Green on the Veterans Park memorial project. MKSK provided a great implementation plan, extensive list of relevant projects, and suggested working with the Special Event Schedule.

Mr. Mikos asked why the top 3 are listed if 2 of them did not indicate they would partner with an architect. Director Springer explained that all applicants missed something, however, the top 3 scored the highest overall taking in consideration all categories.

Reference checks were also presented for the top 3 consultants. Upland's references were overwhelmingly positive, consistently met expectations and would be hired again. HR Green's references were generally positive, but most references were for engineering projects. Similar for MKSK.

---

The RFP indicated that any information submitted in the RFP would become the property of City of Wood Dale. Two of the proposals included proposed concept plans. Staff reviewed all proposals and created a list of innovative ideas for SEEC to consider.

The RFP schedule was reviewed with SEEC noting when the RFP was issued on July 2 and was due by August 2. Following SEEC recommendation, the RFP proposals will be presented to City Council during a Workshop on September 26 with final City Council approval scheduled for October.

Staff recommendation was presented asking SEEC to review the proposals and evaluation information and provide recommendation to the PZB Committee and a preferred firm. There was a short discussion on Lacota Group including review of their prior projects. HR Green was also discussed, with emphasis that they are an engineering. Many of the firms are civic/park planners with a lot of prior experience and they are more likely to present innovative ideas. Upland stood out because only 3 cons were identified. Ald. Curiale also noted that their example projects listed costs, and they are local. Mr. Baxi asked if prior experience is critical, Director Springer explained that it was not required in the RFP; it was reviewed but it did not impact the ranking. Mr. Malone wanted to review the Innovative Ideas and Pro/Con lists for Upland. Project examples from Upland were presented including a few projects in nearby municipalities including Elk Grove Village, Naperville, Wheeling. Projects were tailored to show examples of projects that have components that are similar to what City is looking for. Ald. Curiale asked if staff has any experience working with any of the consultants. Director Springer has had experience with or heard of most of the consultants except for two MKSK and Fehr Graham. Ms. Masilotti inquired if the forms knew what the total budget was for the project. Director Springer explained that the RFP noted that \$50,000 was allocated for the consultant to prepare the plan, however, no total project cost for the park was provided.

Mr. Baxi made the motion to recommend Upland Design as the consultant, seconded by Mr. Melone. Motion as followed by discussion noting that Fern Graham did not have impressive examples. Motion passed by voice call, with 5 yes, and 0 nos.

Following, the motion, SEEC reviewed the list of Innovative Ideas highlighting which of the items should be recommended to the Council.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

---

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Baxi and seconded by Mr. Mikos; it carried unanimously by voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 7:58 pm.

*Minutes taken by Gosia Pociecha*

DRAFT