DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Milwaukee County

Date: February 18, 2019

Project: Mitchell Park Horticultural Conservatory – Feasibility RFP – Phase III

By: Julie Bastin, P.E.

Project No.: P49003

Subject: DRAFT - REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (R.F.P.) - DRAFT

The Milwaukee County Task Force on the Mitchell Park Conservatory Domes has identified two possible paths forward for the Conservatory and is seeking additional support before making a final recommendation to the Milwaukee County Board. Briefly, the Task Force is considering two possible directions for the 50+ year old facility:

Task Force Identified Options¹

- 1. Targeted Investments
 - a. Address deferred maintenance
 - b. Support targeted investments
- 2. Eco Dome Destination
 - a. Address deferred maintenance
 - b. Support targeted investments
 - c. Add new immersive Ecological Habitat Zone and other enhancements

Having completed two phases of its work (Phase I: Development of Options and Phase 2: Community Input), the Task Force is now seeking additional support in reviewing these two possible paths forward. This RFP is for support in identifying partnering and funding feasibility, as well as pro forma business plans, for these two options.

Phase III: Feasibility Analyses for Potential Paths Forward

This RFP is intended to help the Task Force understand and evaluate the feasibility and long-term viability of the options that it has identified for the future direction of the Mitchell Park Conservatory Domes, examining potential partnerships, funding and revenue options, and business plans.

Task 1: Partnership and operating model analysis. Provide recommendations on partnership opportunities and related governance necessary to develop and support the two options envisioned by the Task Force, recognizing that Milwaukee County may be unable with current resources and operating structure to develop and manage an expanded facility

¹ For more details, see "Mitchell Park Horticultural Conservatory Future Path and Feasibility Study" prepared by ConsultEcon, Inc. and HGA, July 31, 2018

Deliverables:

- Report on partnering possibilities and related operating models, with recommendations on the timing and approach for changes, including the role of Milwaukee County in the short, intermediate, and long term
- Please note that this analysis should include a "baseline" with Milwaukee County as a sole developer and operator of each of the two Task Force options, as well as analyses that include various partnership models. Please identify how partnerships may trigger changes to the expected attendance, programming, revenue and expenses, and facility requirements. These possible expansions should be included in all subsequent operations, structure, financial, and business analyses.

Task 2: Revenues, funding and fundraising feasibility. Provide analysis of likely funding sources for developing and operating each of the two alternatives identified by the Task Force, incorporating any possible impacts from partnerships

Deliverables:

- Report on funding opportunities for the Conservatory under each of the two scenarios outlined by the Task Force and informed by the partnership analysis. Please include possible sources of funding and their implications, including: admissions and earned revenues (program fees, food service, rentals, parking, memberships, and other activities typically generated by similar facilities); government funding; government bonding and other loans; grants and private donations; historic tax credits, and other sources.
- For each major funding source, please identify any potential issues and range of funding that may be reasonably expected, including under various partnership alternatives. Please include findings or observations about the donor / philanthropic environment in Milwaukee region and how the Domes, either alone or in partnership, might compete.
- Please distinguish between possible funding sources for deferred maintenance / capital improvements / other investments and for operating needs for both of the Task Force's alternatives. Please identify how various partnership models may affect these alternatives.

Task 3: Expenditure budgets. Develop budgetary cost estimates based on programming and space needs for Task Force selected alternatives, including the possible impact of partnerships on programming and facility requirements.

Deliverables:

- Conceptual space use plans (not designs), based on typical programming standards and possible partnership needs
- Conceptual budgetary cost estimates for construction for both Task Force selected alternatives, as well as any likely partnership requirements
- Conceptual budgetary cost estimates for maintenance and operations costs, including possible staffing models and other key cost elements such as major maintenance and system upgrades over time.

Task 4: Pro Forma Business Plans. Provide a summary report for use by the Task Force, as well as the County Board, that provides overall and integrated understanding of the two options for the Mitchell Park Domes identified by the Task Force.

Deliverables:

- Summary report for each of the two Task Force options, including projected cash flows, income statements and balance sheets, with likely scenarios based on prior analysis of partnerships, financing options, and expenditures, highlighting expectations for Milwaukee County contributions as well as other partners / funding sources. The timeframe for the analysis should match the expected life of the facility and / or any long-term financing expected.
- Please discuss the potential for phasing activities over time and explain how that might be structured and managed. In particular, in what order and how might the County approach developing partnerships, addressing deferred maintenance, and enhancing the facility in order to improve the probability of success and create a sustainable long-term future for the facility?

Other expectations of this RFP:

- Recommendation of preferred feasible solution to Task Force, including multi-media presentation and final report of findings
- Attend and discuss findings at a minimum of three Task Force Meetings.