



ARCHITECTURE, ENGINEERING, & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SECTION

CONSULTANT RETENTION / CONSULTANT SELECTION APPROVAL

Date:

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Title:

Project No.:

Agreement Type:

Lump Sum - Not-To-Exceed **Type "A" or "D" Agreement**

Lump Sum - Not-To-Exceed **Type "B" Agreement – Annual**

Actual Cost - Not-To-Exceed Fee **Type "B" Agreement – Annual**

Actual Cost - Not-to-Exceed Fee **Type "C" Agreement**

II. CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCEDURE



III. RECOMMENDED CONSULTANT SELECTION

Consultant:

ANTICIPATED NTE FEE:

IV. D/TBE UTILIZATION

Approved D/TBE Participation Recommendation Form (D/TBE-12 Form if 0% goal) or "D/TBE" Utilization Report (D/TBE-14 Form approved by CBDP office) are attached.

V. FISCAL NOTE

VI. FEDERAL FUNDING

This project includes federal funding and meets the requirements of AMOP 14.80.44.

VII. SPECIAL NOTES

VIII. COVID19 PREPAREDNESS PLAN

Check the box to confirm the Unit Head has approved the Consultant COVID19 Preparedness Plan and the PM has notified the vendor in writing of approval, copying the project file, Unit Head, and Director of AE&ES.

PREPARED BY:

Attachments: Consultant Scope of Work w/Task-Hours Matrix
Approved D/TBE Participation Form
1684 Form (14.80.76.F1)

Project Understanding & Background

Throughout its existence, the Mitchell Park Domes has been viewed as a cherished icon serving not only Milwaukee County residents, but global tourists that travel to the area. The Domes, comprised of three (3) horticultural conservancy ecosystems, is an impactful and valuable resource for the community where the stunning exterior of the unique glass and concrete framed facility has classified the structure as a “one of a kind” landmark attraction. However, it is this same distinctive-series conical structure, coupled with the facility’s age and deferred maintenance, that has placed the building at a “tipping point” requiring a thoughtful and appropriate course of action for its future.



In addition, recent studies have been prepared over the last two decades to evaluate the Domes and the use of Mitchell Park surrounding lands to maximize the community activity and potential social/economic viability of the property. These studies need to be reviewed, alternatives assessed, and construction estimates vetted and updated into today’s dollars, to properly begin to provide an economically feasible and sustainable planning tool for the County to utilize for making responsible fiscal decisions.

The County must consider avoiding the threat to delay actions and find solutions. The basic options identified in the RFP provide a starting point to help assess a future direction for the County to take.

The Concord Team will, in collaboration with the County, define and apply effective decision-making criteria inclusive of analyzing and updating construction costs for the previously evaluated alternatives. This effort will include total lifecycle cost and Net Present Value (NPV) analyses to properly compare the replacement strategies. In addition, our team will join forces with the County to 1) conduct architectural and planning services to further

assess the alternatives, 2) provide architectural rendering and visualization clarity of alternatives, 3) facilitate public engagement and presentation, and 4) produce preliminary and final reports. This effort will include seeking to build better community connection to the entire Mitchell Park property and surrounding neighborhoods.



Our uniquely qualified team, consists of consultants that have specialized expertise that can achieve the following objectives:

- Expertise in Cost Management, specific to construction cost estimating, the principal initiative for this project
- Understanding of total lifecycle costs through a NPV analysis of construction and operating costs
- Familiarity of previously completed engineering and planning projects/studies. Members of our team completed many of those evaluations
- Unmatched knowledge concerning the larger community context and planning objectives associated with Mitchell Park in its entirety, thereby bringing consistency and efficiency to the process
- Working experience to ascertain long-term revenue streams from public and private sources at a high-level.
- Skills at finding viable solutions amidst this complex fabric of interconnected issues.

Scope of Services

Identified RFP focus for the project, *“The purpose of the planning process is to identify an economically viable and sustainable facility solution that satisfies the needs of the community and is in accordance with best practices for similar urban horticultural conservatories. The results of this study will be used to inform future facility planning and design.”*

Project Management

The Concord Team will develop and share a Project Work Plan and Responsibility Matrix in the Project Initiation phase that will summarize the project goals, objectives, responsibilities, and schedule for the successful completion of the project. Collaborating with Parks staff, this Work Plan provides the backbone to the project process and is a living document that will help keep all project team members on task to achieve the project milestones. Tasks will include:

- Define communication channels and points of meeting schedules.
- Establish key milestones.
- Meetings minutes will be taken, and action items will be distributed accordingly.
- Identify potential risks as the project planning evolves and address these threats accordingly.
- Coordinate all work from subconsultants and communicate the status with County staff.

Data Collection and Analysis

Substantial research and documented data collection has been completed previously with multiple studies over the last decade. The team will sift through and prioritize the key components of those reports to vet and update the construction cost estimates associated with the documents. Efforts proposed are as follows:

- Summarize key findings from past studies.
- Identify criteria that should be used in making decisions.
- Select key excerpts and references to be included in final report that fully reflect past studies and participants.
- Emphasize a range of community missions addressed by the Domes and the surrounding park including recreation, education, social events, programmed and unprogrammed activities, history of activity.
- Collect relevant economic data on costs and revenue to provide a basis for evaluation of NPV cash flow.

- Gather data inclusive of both capital and operating costs and revenues.
- Assemble data from select comparable facilities used as benchmarks to evaluate proposed alternatives and variation on those alternatives.
- Meet with Parks leadership and other staff directly involved with parks planning and management.
- Prepare an NPV analysis for each of the four alternatives listed in the RFP inclusive of potential long-term costs and revenues (this assessment shall be confirmed at the kick-off meeting and may be expanded to include variations on these alternatives).

Alternatives Analysis

With the assistance of the Parks staff, we will formulate a matrix to be used to evaluate each Alternative and compare the findings of our analysis. The process will include:

- Develop policy-based decision criteria to rank and weight the different options including:
 - Final criteria for phasing, capital, and operating expenses.
 - Multiple NPV scenarios based on internal sub options related to phasing, programming, and critical factors.
 - Social and cultural facility needs and issues.
 - Public perceptions and branding.
- Include an evaluation of the four major alternatives and potential sub options for
 - Demolition and replacements (as well as partial, conditional, and phased demolition)
 - Limited scope repairs, expanded (if desired) to include long-term moth-balling options
 - Full building envelope replacement (and, if desired, partial envelope replacement with alternative uses)
- Use the criteria to evaluate each option and, if needed, modify the criteria to reflect sensitivity-based estimates (i.e., major changes in the outcomes of the analysis that might be due to moderate changes in the costs and revenue ranges applied to the metrics)
- Use of cash-flow estimates based on both current fees and revenues from the Domes as well as models of alternative fee and revenue derived from comparable facilities.

Architectural Rendering and Visualization of Alternatives

As part of the discussions with the Parks Staff, we will prepare associated visualizations and renderings to conceptualize the results of the alternatives analysis, as follows:

- Develop renderings and visualization materials of alternatives including improvements to Mitchell Park and the Domes
- Create images intended to portray different experiences and outcomes more so that specific architectural components.
- Develop scenarios for expansion of the programming and facility within Mitchell Park including social activation uses consistent with the facility as an “urban botanical park and conservatory.”

Public Engagement and Outreach

An important component of the project will be to perform Public Outreach with various County Boards and stakeholders. It is understood the project is complex in nature with many opinions of how the Domes and Mitchell Park should be utilized. The purpose of the project will be to comprehend past evaluations and communicate the updated viable cost results in accordance with industry standards.

- In concert with Parks staff, conduct online public engagement and outreach to share results of the study.
- Prepare a final presentation report depicting the results of the evaluation.
- Summarize the results of the evaluation in a presentation to two (2) presentations to the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors and one (1) open house presentation to key stakeholders.

Suggested Alternatives

Milwaukee County Parks should understand that the Project Approach prepared by the Concord Team above specifically addresses the priorities laid out in the Request for Proposal and updates the decisions and costs that are imbedded in previously completed reports. Our Team is well-suited to answer the initial request for information and provide direction for the County to take the next steps.

However, we offer some suggested alternatives to continue “down the path” to logically implement follow-up guidance. The two Alternates with suggested future planning initiatives are summarized below for the County’s consideration:

Planning Evaluations from a Botanical Garden Expert

- Additional Park activities and components to address community involvement.
- Additional Park activities that generate additional revenue.
- Additional Park improvements that create a Destination identity for the area.

Planning Evaluations from a Financial Analysis Expert

- Prepare a Financial Analysis Update utilizing the results of Cost Estimating NPV analysis
- Additional value to the improvements made on Mitchell Park that includes viability of long-term financial sustainability of proposed options.
- Additional value associated with the increases in Property Values surrounding the Park. This may need further multi-governmental agreements with the City of Milwaukee to develop a Tax Incremental District.

Concord Team - Constant Effort Matrix																	Subtotal	
		John Duggan	Jim Joehnk	Justin Johnson	John Tilleman	Rob White	Ali Noel	Larry Witzling	Stephanie Hacke	Jim Lisak	Joe Peplone	Jessica Culver	Erv Stern	Eileen McEnroe Hanks	Chris Socha	Therese Hanson		Joe Milella
No.	Task Description	Concord Principal Quality Control	Concord Project Executive	Concord Alts./Matts. Assessment	Concord Cost Management Director	Concord Cost Management Senior MEP	Concord Assistant P.M.	GRAEF Planner	GRAEF Planner	GRAEF Civil	GRAEF Landscape	GRAEF Mech./Plumb.	GRAEF Electrical	McEnroe Struct/Assess	TKWA Partner Architect	TKWA Project Architect	TKWA Lead Designer	
0.	General Scope Requirements																	
0.1	Misc Project Management and CTY consultation.		4				4	8	8					0				24
0.2	Attend Bi-weekly Virtual Project Team Meetings with the CTY (Total of 12 meetings over 6 months - assumed ave. 1.0 hours in length).		12				12	6	10	4	4	2	2	12	6	12		82
0.3	Prepare Project Schedule and update that includes milestones for decisions to be made by MKE CTY, consultant(s), and level of completion		2				8		2					0	1	4		17
0.4	Issue meeting minutes / progress reports incorporating updates on scope, schedule, budget, and deliverables on a bi-weekly basis		4				16							0				20
1.	Task One - Data Collection and Analysis																	
1.1	Meet with Parks Leadership to confirm project approach, schedule and budget to satisfy objectives of MKE County. Assume one (1) meeting - 2 hours long.	2	2		2		2	4	8	2	2			2	2	2		30
1.2	Collect, review and synthesize information gathered from prior documented planning efforts. Information provided by MKE County/Parks. Specific attention paid to cost estimating and total life-cycle costs for each Alternative as it concern building material lifespan and replacement schedule.		6	14	12	8	8	4	4	4	4	4	4	12	4	8		96
1.3	Conduct a net present value (NPV) analysis of the total cost of each Alternative. The NPV analysis will include an estimate of total facility lifecycle costs and lifespan of building materials.		4	14	4		4	4						0				30
2.	Task Two - Alternative Analysis																	
2.1	In consultation with MKE CTY staff, develop criteria to evaluate alternatives identified in Task One, including but not limited to those referenced in Resolution #22-1184, as follows:	2	4											4	2	2		14
	a. Demolition, includes estimate for site improvements for Mitchell Park if the Domes are demolished.		1		16					2	2			2				23
	b. Limited scope repairs to address deferred maintenance and code compliance concerns.		1		16	12						4	4	4				41
	c. Full building renovation including building envelope (glass, seals, concrete, coating, etc).		1		16	12						4	4	8				45
	d. Phase III ArtsMarket, LLC proposal for a New Urban Botanical Park and Conservatory.		1		16	12		4	4	4	4			4				49
2.2	Analyze each Alternative in 2.1 based on the criteria established and summarize the results.	2	4					4	4	2	2	2	2	4	4	8		38
3.	Task Three - Architectural Rendering and Visualization of the Alternatives																	
3.1	Produce renderings and visualization materials of the four alternatives including Mitchell Park and the Domes. Note - the renderings are intended for information purposes to advance planning, not construction.	1	2											0	8	16	200	227
3.2	Develop scenarios for expansion of the Domes programming and facility into Mitchell Park. Visual representation of ideas for expansion of the Domes should align with the "urban botanical park and conservancy" outlined in the alternative analysis phase.	1	2					2	2	2	2			0	16	16	40	83
4.0	Task Four - Public Engagement and Outreach																	
4.1	In consultation with Parks staff, conduct public outreach and engagement related to the results of this project.	1	4				4	6	12					0				
4.2	Production and presentation to the reports and associated research materials, including but not limited to two (2) presentations to the MKE CTY Board of Supervisors, one (1) public meeting, and an assumed two meetings with applicable stakeholders.	1	6	4	8	4	8	12	24					0	1	4	8	
	Sub Total Hours	10	60	32	90	48	66	54	78	20	20	16	16	52	44	72	248	819
	Hourly Rates	Incl.	\$215.00	\$175.00	\$215.00	\$175.00	\$105.00	\$215.00	\$205.00	\$215.00	\$205.00	\$171.00	\$195.00	\$175.00	\$161.00	\$114.00	\$104.00	
	Total Section	Incl.	\$12,900.00	\$5,600.00	\$19,350.00	\$8,400.00	\$6,930.00	\$11,610.00	\$15,990.00	\$4,300.00	\$4,100.00	\$2,736.00	\$3,120.00	\$9,100.00	\$7,084.00	\$8,208.00	\$25,792.00	\$145,220.00
	Total Hours:	10	60	32	90	48	66	54	78	20	20	16	16	52	44	72	248	819
	TOTALS:	0.00	12,900.00	5,600.00	19,350.00	8,400.00	6,930.00	11,610.00	15,990.00	4,300.00	4,100.00	2,736.00	3,120.00	9,100.00	7,084.00	8,208.00	25,792.00	145,220.00
	SUB TOTAL:	\$145,220																
	CONCORD FEE:	\$145,220																
	Projected Expenses:	incl.																
	TOTAL TBE (%):	43%																
	Concord TBE (%):	37%																
	McEnroe TBE (%):	6%																

Concord Team	
The Concord Group	\$53,180
GRAEF	\$41,856
McEnroe Consulting	\$9,100
TKWA	<u>\$41,084</u>

SUB-TOTAL TEAM FEE Breakout \$145,220

MILWAUKEE COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
ARCHITECTURE, ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SECTION

PROJECT: Mitchell Park Domes Future State Planning and Construction Cost Estimating
PROJECT NO. P076501

CONSULTANT PROPOSAL

I. BASIC SERVICES: Mitchell Park Domes Future State Planning and Construction Cost Estimating
(Include services of all needed subconsultants)

A. "LUMP SUM" fee for Future State Planning and Construction Cost Estimating: \$
(\$145,220.00)

II. PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE

Name of Principal John Duggan

Engineer's Registration No. in Wisconsin N/A

Flat hourly rate for principal \$300.00

Participation of Targeted Business Enterprises at the rate of 12% will be required for each project.

Firm Name The Concord Group

Authorized Signature 

Title Chief Operating Officer

Date 3/1/2023

