

February 27, 2023

To All Interested Consultants

Project: Mitchell Park Domes Future State
Planning and Construction Cost Estimating

PROJECT NO. P076501

Subject: CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS AND
ANSWERS TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (R.F.P.)

Question 1 – In the RFP there is a stipulation that the selected consultant or contractor would be precluded from bidding on the construction process, is this the intent of the County?

Answer 1 – No, that is not the intent. The selected contractors are not prevented from bidding on future construction and design. This will be clarified as an amendment to the RFP.

Question 2 – Over the years there have many alternatives discussed, in this phase of the project how many and what alternatives will you be looking at?

Answer 2 - At a minimum the scope of work of the alternative analysis includes the 4 alternatives provided by the Milwaukee County Board on page 4 of the RFP –

- The 4th alternative(the “ArtsMarket report”) has already been studied and deemed as not feasible for implementation. The 4th alternative can be viewed as a “build new” option that may include elements from other alternatives and it represents on the spectrum of alternatives that have already been established a more fully developed conservatory beyond just the existing Domes structures.

Question 3 – What prior plans will be made available and a part of this current analysis?

Answer 3 – They are attached to the RFP posting.

Question 4 – Are you expecting the selected team to re-engineer any of the options?

Answer 4 – The selected consultant will base their analysis on alternatives already developed.

Question 5 – There is one other detailed analysis underway related to the mockup of a glass and aluminum façade for the domes (the “mockup”), will results of that analysis be used to inform this process?

Answer 5 – It is anticipated that the mockup design project will help inform this analysis. It is unknown the timing of when results will be available from the mockup and when that information could be used in this project.

Question 6 – The alternative listed on page 4 related to demolition also includes a note about “demolition and future site improvements”, that is a very open-ended consideration, can the future site improvements be defined with more specificity?

Answer 6 – Based upon prior estimates of demolition “site improvements” would involve the restoration of the current Domes footprint to an open space that is publicly accessible. Future park amenity planning would need to occur if other improvements were to be contemplated and are not a part of this analysis.

Question 7 – How much public involvement is there in this process?

Answer 7 – That will need to be determined in the consultants’ proposal. Earlier phases of planning for the Domes future state have included public engagement.

Question 8 – The alternatives defined by the County Board that are included in the Scope of Work of this project include specific reference to the “ArtsMarket report” but the plan within that report has already been thoroughly analyzed and deemed not feasible. How can a consultant assess this alternative with this in mind? How can I address this in a scope of work that makes sense?

Answer 8- The ArtsMarket report and analysis is attached to the RFP. The intent of this is to define an option that pushes the County in a direction of building consensus around a preferred alternative. This 4th alternative represents an option of “building new” conservatory elements beyond the existing Domes structure.