Lighthouses / signals Waterlife Experience at Lake Millstätter See 2008/09

Inspection minutes of the preliminary discussion for the competition on 12 November at *Impulscenter Seeboden* at 10.00 a.m.

Participants:
Architect DI Franz Sumnitsch, BKK-3
DI Dietmar Müller, commission for townscape conservation
DI Winfried Steiner, Kärnten wasser.reich (Carinthia water.realm)
Mag. Mario Waste, Kärnten wasser.reich (Carinthia water.realm)
DI Bernhard Wohlmuther, local planning authority, Spittal/Drau

Supplements to the Tender:

The following documents serve as legal basis:

- Regulations of the Bundesvergabegesetzes BvergG2006 (Federal Act on Tenders)
- Tender documents including attachments
- Written reply to questions
- Minutes of the hearing

Deadlines

- Deadline for replying to the questions - 3 December 12.00 a.m. at the competition office.
- Substitute juror for technical juror:
  Mag. Christine Wetzlinger Grundnig, Advisory Board for Fine Arts
  Dr. Arnulf Rohsmann, Department 5, Culture
  DI Erich Fercher, Department for Overground Workings

  Substitute juror for local community juror:
  shall be nominated in time.

Questions raised during the on-site inspection:

1. The lighthouses are embedded in the “wasser.reich” experience concept. Which events shall take place in this context and where shall they be held?

   See detailed description in the tender documents.

2. Is there visual contact between the individual lighthouses?

   Not between all of them, but on a clear day you can see at least the next lighthouse. However, this is not true for the lighthouse in Radenthein, which is planned to be mounted outside the lake area.

3. What type of effect should the signals have?

   This is to be determined by the participants in the competition. Since the distances mentioned cover several kilometres one ought also take into account the atmospheric conditions. Besides, there should be a basic pattern that allows to recognize the entire series of lighthouses as a unity.

4. Should the towers be accessible for visitors?

   In principle, no. Only the tower in Millstatt shall be open to visitors. The remaining towers need only be accessible for purposes of maintenance.

5. Should the towers contain any further points of information?

   No, this is not requested.

6. What should be the height of the towers?

   The height of the towers can be freely chosen. Aspects to consider are visibility, true-to-scale representation, statics and adherence to the cost plan.

7. What should be the working life of the lighthouses?

   The lighthouses are temporary structures and should serve their purpose at least for a period of two years. After that, it will be decided whether they will be dismantled or left standing. This project is not about erecting monuments.

8. Is an operation during winter to be taken into account?

   Depending on the conceptual design and the materials used, it may be necessary to dismantle the towers in winter or to make them winterproof. In such case, the costs for a one-time winter operation are to be included in the estimate of costs.

9. Is approval from authorities required?

   Since it is to be assumed that the lighthouses classify as building constructions, submission of documents and approval from authorities shall be required. This also applies to the static proof of stability.

10. Is approval from authorities also required for works of art?

    Whether the construction shall classify as work of art or not depends on the design but has no influence on the basic requirement of a building permit once the work of art reaches a certain height.

11. Who will be the client?

    For all lighthouses the client shall be the Millstätter See Tourismus GmbH. The various building authorities, however, are the individual municipalities in which the properties are located.

12. When are the lighthouses to be completed?

    The time schedule is very tight. The handing-over date of the functioning lighthouses shall be 17 May 2008. After the decision taken by the jury, submissions will have to be made very quickly in order to respect the deadlines and deal with any objections that may be raised. For these reasons, the jury shall attach much importance to the feasibility of the proposals and their compliance with the cost plan.

13. What is included in the total costs?

    The costs of EUR 370,000.00 (without VAT) shall cover all manufacturing costs including the foundation, all auxiliary construction costs such as planning, statics, etc. but also the costs of dismantling after the end of the project period. There may also be some winter costs that need to be factored in.

    The power connection provided by the municipalities and the costs with regard to the approval by the authorities, are not to be taken into consideration.

14. Is a tender according to the Bundesvergabegesetz (Federal Act on Tenders) required and what are the threshold values?

    See also item 10. In principle, yes. As for the threshold values, see attachment.

15. What shall be the project procedure in case an artist wins the first prize?

    The contract will be awarded according to a fee proposal that is customary for artists, taking into consideration[1] the prize sum.

16. May construction companies[2] act as consultants and are they eligible for orders?

    Yes, but see also the threshold values in the attachment.

[1] AdÜ.: wenn mit „Anrechnung“ gemeint ist, dass das Preisgeld abgezogen wird, sollte im Englischen „deducting the prize sum“ stehen. Falls hingegen gemeint ist, dass zum Auftragswert das Preisgeld noch hinzugezählt wird, sollte man die Formulierung „in addition to the prize sum“ wählen. Die von mir verwendete Formulierung „taking into consideration“ ist genauso allgemein wie jene im deutschen Ausgangstext.

[2] AdÜ.: An sich gehe ich davon aus, dass „ausführende Firmen“ bereits einen Auftrag erhalten haben (da sie ja schon Arbeiten ausführen). Ich habe daher im vorliegenden Kontext „ausführende Firmen“ als „Baufirmen“ übersetzt.