

City and County of San Francisco

Informal Bid for

**Comprehensive Survey Methodology for Intangible Cultural
Heritage Assets**



Date issued:
Proposal due:

January 16, 2019
February 19, 2019 3 p.m.

**Informal Bid for
Comprehensive Survey Methodology for Intangible Cultural Heritage Assets**

I. Introduction and Schedule

A. General

The San Francisco Planning Department (“Planning Department”) announces its intent to seek proposals from organizations or individuals interested in contracting to develop a comprehensive methodology for the public and Planning Department staff to identify and evaluate Cultural Heritage Assets in San Francisco as part of its Citywide Survey effort.

The intended timeline from the start of work to completion would be 24 weeks (six months) for all phases of the project, not to exceed 28 weeks (seven months) total.

The contract shall have an original term of one year. In addition, the Planning Department shall have an option to extend the term for an additional period of one year, which the Planning Department may exercise in its sole, absolute discretion. However, work is expected to be completed within 6 months.

The total amount of the contract is not to exceed \$55,000 (fifty-five thousand dollars).

B. Schedule

The anticipated schedule is:

<u>Proposal Phase</u>	<u>Date</u>
Informal Bid is issued by the City	<u>1/16/19</u>
Pre-Qualification Conference	<u>2/4/19</u>
Proposals due	<u>2/19/19</u>

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND

Beginning in earnest in 2017, the Planning Department has been collaborating with the Getty Conservation Institute to collect historical information on buildings in San Francisco. This historic resource survey (“Survey”) is a systematic method of documenting historic resources through fieldwork and research, including the collection of data and displaying findings within the Arches collector application and inventory management system (“Arches”). As both a data collection and a data management tool, Arches will allow for efficient and comprehensive documentation using limited resources and will encourage public participation in data collection efforts.

The goals of the Survey are as follows:

1. To provide historic resource determinations on the remaining portions of San Francisco that have yet to be surveyed for eligibility under the California Register of Historical Resources;
2. To develop tools and document tangible and intangible cultural heritage assets; and,
3. To provide all data in a publicly-accessible format that may be updated by the Planning Department or the public on a regular basis.

This effort is supported by the Historic Preservation Commission and several organizations, including San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (“SPUR”), that have stressed the need for the City to provide historic resource survey information citywide.

II. DOCUMENTATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

San Francisco’s definition of cultural heritage is guided by the work of leading international cultural heritage organizations and the input received through our most recent community-led cultural heritage strategies work in Japantown, SoMa, and the Mission neighborhoods. Broadly defined, cultural heritage is how a community expresses the embodiment of its beliefs, customs, practices, artistic expression, and significant places. It’s how a community inspires pride and awareness of its cultural assets which embolden a sense of identity and responsibility to society at large. These expressions include both tangible and intangible elements passed from generation to generation. Those tangible or intangible assets can be defined as anything that contributes to cultural identity - arts activities, songs, performances, celebrations, protests, buildings, literature, businesses, nonprofits, and other types of institutions. An example of San Francisco’s tangible LGBTQ cultural heritage is the Harvey Milk Residence Castro Camera Building on Castro Street. Examples of intangible assets are the Pride celebration and the Dyke March held in the City every June. While they differ greatly in their form, each are equally valued for what they represent and each pose unique preservation challenges if threatened. Over the last several years, various communities have sought tools to document and provide support to their tangible and intangible cultural heritage. These tools do not currently exist and are beyond our current widely-accepted documentation and survey practices.

The Planning Department seeks to incorporate the documentation of cultural heritage into its Survey as a means to supplement typical data collection methods. Potential new tools that would spatialize intangible heritage data within Arches could include cultural mapping and audio files. Survey data will be integrated into publicly accessible databases, such as Planning’s Parcel Information Map (“PIM”).

The data collection effort of tangible and intangible cultural heritage assets is intended to be community-driven; therefore, methodology development must include input from various communities that have a high probability of utilizing the tools.

III. SCOPE OF WORK

The scope of work for this project is to develop a comprehensive methodology for identification and evaluation of Cultural Heritage Assets in San Francisco as part of the Planning Department's Survey effort. The scope of work is to be used as a general guide and is not intended to be a complete list of all work necessary to complete the project, but outlines the key elements and services the selected vendor(s) will provide in the deliverables noted below:

This project will address the following questions:

1. How to identify and organize a range of cultural heritage asset types;
2. How data should be collected;
3. How information should be filtered and displayed for public or internal use;
4. How the city-family should best use the data collected, especially in support development of Cultural Districts (areas with physical boundaries that are distinguished by unique social and historical associations and living traditions) and/or Survey evaluation; and
5. Policies and internal protocols that the Planning Department should implement to ensure the data is used appropriately.

Deliverables should include:

1. Written report summarizing baseline research regarding identification and evaluation of tangible and intangible cultural heritage assets, to include, at minimum:
 - International best practices for cultural heritage assets identification and evaluation
 - Summary of interviews with Planning Department staff
 - Review of Planning Department existing policies and tools
 - Bibliography
2. Written report summarizing results of in-person focus groups, to include, at minimum:
 - A summary of results from in-person focus groups with selected community members/key stakeholders and follow-up consultation with City staff
 - Lists of specific comments from stakeholder group(s) in an appendix to the written report
3. Written report providing a summary of findings and making recommendations to address the project questions, to include, at minimum:

- Assessment of results from baseline research and focus group interviews
- Recommendations for methodology to identify, protect, and enhance tangible and intangible cultural heritage assets
- Recommendations for methodology to support and encourage public participation in the identification and evaluation of tangible and intangible cultural heritage assets
- Recommendations for an evaluative framework for tangible and intangible cultural heritage assets for Survey purposes

IV. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

A. Format

To be considered for this contract, please submit your bid by the due date and time listed on the cover. Postmarks will not be considered in judging the timeliness of submissions. Proposers must submit a hard copy and one electronic PDF copy of the proposal to Deborah.L.Gill@sfgov.org. Proposals may be delivered in person and left with Debbie Gill or mailed to:

Debbie Gill
 Contract Analyst
 San Francisco Planning Department
 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
 San Francisco, CA 94103

B. Content

Firms interested in responding to this Informal Bid must submit the following information:

- A short statement describing your firm’s experience developing survey methodologies, providing technical support and analysis for community-led economic development strategies, and experience working with government agencies on similar projects, with a minimum of two (2) references.
- Provision of a minimum of two (2) examples of similar projects, including a brief narrative description of the scope of work, list of personnel involved, and the timeframe or schedule for the project.
- Proposed project staff, project team organization and qualifications.
- An itemized statement of work, including projected hours, pricing, service and subtotal outlining budget details.
- SF City vendor number, or state ability to comply with CCSF’s contracting requirements.

- Role, experience, and qualifications of any subcontractor(s), if desired.

C. Minimum Qualifications

At least three years of consulting or work experience in the following areas is required:

- Developing and facilitating focus groups
- Developing survey methodologies for the identification and evaluation of properties for eligibility on local, state, and federal historic registers
- Building Historic Preservation/Cultural Heritage expertise within interested communities with limited capacity/resources
- Developing policies to support ethical data management
- Developing policies to highlight the connection between Historic Preservation/Cultural Heritage and affordable housing, sustainability, social justice, and economic development

All staff assigned to the project must meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR Part 61).

Proposals should clearly demonstrate that the qualifications are met. Insufficient or incomplete information may result in a proposal being considered non-responsive and ineligible for award of the contract. If required information is complete, but the department determines that the proposer does not meet minimum qualifications, proposer may be deemed non-responsive.

Selection Criteria

Each RFP response will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria below. Evaluation will be based solely on written response to RFP.

1. Firm / Team Qualifications (50 points)
 - a. Expertise of the firm related to the minimum qualifications noted in RFP, particularly in developing policies that highlight the connection between Historic Preservation/Cultural Heritage and community-led economic development strategies;
 - b. Experience conducting focus groups and building Historic Preservation/Cultural Heritage expertise within interested communities with limited capacity/resources;
 - c. Experience developing historic resource survey methodologies for tangible and intangible resources;
 - d. Experience with recent similar scopes of work;

- e. Established quality assurance/quality control plan for project deliverables to ensure a high level of professional quality and technical accuracy prior to document submittal; and
 - f. Results of reference checks.
2. Assigned Staff (40 points)
- a. Recent experience of staff assigned to the project and a description of the tasks to be performed by each staff person. Experience should be focused on the items noted in Minimum Qualifications.
 - b. Professional qualifications and education, including number of years of relevant professional experience. Assigned staff must include professionals meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR Part 61).
3. Overall Format of Submission (10 points)
- a. Clear, concise, and addresses all topic areas

V. Pre-Qualification Conference

Respondents are encouraged, but not required, to attend a pre-qualification conference for this RFP. The pre-qualification conference will be held at the **Planning Department at 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103 on February 4, 2019 at 10 am**. All questions will be addressed at this conference and any available new information will be provided at this time. If you have further questions regarding the RFP, please contact Debbie Gill at Deborah.L.Gill@sfgov.org.

Pre-Qualification Conference Q & A

1. Is the bid for tangible and intangible assets, and if so do they need separate methodologies?

Yes, the bid is for tangible and intangible assets. Separate methodologies are not necessary, but if they are separate both would need to be able to be incorporated into the Arches program.

2. Could you please provide more information on Arches?

The Arches website can provide more information - <https://www.archesproject.org/>

The Planning Department doesn't currently have an Arches database. As methodologies develop, they should be compatible so that Arches could potentially capture this information.

3. How much collaboration is planned between the Planning Department and the consultant?

There will be a fair amount of collaboration to understand needs and expected capabilities. However, the consultant as a third party will collect data and provide stand alone recommendations to ensure that this is an open process.

4. What do you mean by ethical data management?

It is a guideline for how we will use information collected from the public in discussing cultural practices and intangible resources and what is important to them, how we will use that information, and the anonymity of their feedback.

5. What if there is specific information for a specific community?

The methodology needs to be general enough to be more widely applicable but can include recommendations for specific communities.

6. Does the Planning Department have synopses for individual communities already?

No.

7. How does this bid fit into the Citywide survey?

It is expected that the timeline will lag behind the survey but will fold into the methodology, specifically to address identification of properties or assets significant under National Register and/or California Register Criterion 1/A and 2/B; these types of resources or assets have been more difficult to identify during previous survey processes.

The work in this bid is meant to help with public outreach, look beyond architecture, and addresses other culturally significant assets. It is hoped that it will result in a recommendation for a platform for how the public can provide information to the Planning Department, so that it can be an ongoing conversation.

8. Is the consultant expected to provide interagency collaboration?

There is no interagency collaboration specific to the methodology development. The Planning Department plans to brief other agencies about the survey process in order to learn what data would be useful to them.

9. Why are you doing this now in this way; did other efforts in the past not work?

This is meant to be a more holistic approach for documenting tangible resources; other examples were very tailored and requested specific criteria. The goal is to develop a standardized methodology so any community could enter data into Arches for evaluation.

10. Who will be interviewed, and how many interviews will there be?

After selection, during scoping process, it will be determined how many participate. Proposals can include an estimated number to fit into a budget. The Planning Department will develop a list of key stakeholders in collaboration with the consultant.

11. Will the methodology address tribal cultural properties as well?

Potentially; the main goal is to provide a framework to allow communities to be an expert in their own history. It raises the question of what a traditional cultural property's (TCP) role is in the development of the methodology.

12. Is the scope of the work limited to the City and County of San Francisco?

Yes, this is for the City and County of San Francisco proper.

13. What is the requirement for community led economic efforts?

As part of new cultural district legislation, the cultural district program is structured to require the development of an economic development strategy. Recording cultural heritage assets is part of developing an economic development strategy.

14. Will firms have another chance to ask questions before the proposal deadline?

Any additional questions must be submitted to Deborah.l.gill@sfgov.org by February 8th, and answers will be posted on February 11th.

BID ADDENDUM

I. Protest Procedures

A. Protest of Non-Responsiveness Determination

Within five working days of the City's issuance of a notice of non-responsiveness, any firm that has submitted a proposal and believes that the City has incorrectly determined that its proposal is non-responsive may submit a written notice of protest. Such notice of protest must be received by the City on or before the fifth working day following the City's issuance of the notice of non-responsiveness. The notice of protest must include a written statement specifying in detail each and every one of the grounds asserted for the protest. The protest must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the proposer, and must cite the law, rule, local ordinance, procedure or RFP provision on which the protest is based. In addition, the protestor must specify facts and evidence sufficient for the City to determine the validity of the protest.

B. Protest of Contract Award

Within five working days of the City's issuance of a notice of intent to award the contract, any firm that has submitted a responsive proposal and believes that the City has incorrectly selected another proposer for award may submit a written notice of protest. Such notice of protest must be received by the City on or before the fifth working day after the City's issuance of the notice of intent to award.

The notice of protest must include a written statement specifying in detail each and every one of the grounds asserted for the protest. The protest must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the proposer, and must cite the law, rule, local ordinance, procedure or RFP provision on which the protest is based. In addition, the protestor must specify facts and evidence sufficient for the City to determine the validity of the protest.

C. Delivery of Protests

All protests must be received by the due date. If a protest is mailed, the protestor bears the risk of non-delivery within the deadlines specified herein. Protests should be transmitted by a means that will objectively establish the date the City received the protest. Protests or notice of protests made orally (e.g., by telephone) will not be considered. Protests must be delivered to:

Debbie Gill
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94103