



**Date Prepared:** April 12, 2016/ revised May 10, 2016  
**Prepared For:** Landmarks Commission  
**Prepared By:** Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner  
**Regarding:** Historic Preservation Plan Scope of Services language for Request for Proposals

## Summary

The attached document related to the Historic Preservation Plan Request for Proposals (RFP) is being provided to the Landmarks Commission for their review and recommendation. The capital budget item that approved the funding for the Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) also included an amendment that “Any scope and Request for Proposals for expenditure of these funds will be recommended by the Landmarks Commission before being submitted to the Common Council for approval.”

Due to the length of the standard City of Madison RFP document, the following sections have been excerpted and are being provided to facilitate the Commission’s review and recommendation:

- Overview
- Scope of Services
- Deliverables

The attached scope of services is organized in four main project parts:

- PART A – HISTORIC RESOURCES DATA
- PART B – PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY
- PART C – HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN
- PART D – UPDATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE FOR EACH LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT

These parts are intentionally not listed in a priority order. The scope of services introduction states, “The following parts should be considered major components of the project, but are not single discrete projects and are expected to be happening simultaneously.”

The Landmarks Commission discussed the Scope of Services at the April 4, 2016 meeting and concluded that more discussion was needed. There was general concern that the allocated funding would not support the scope of services and that prioritization of the listed services was needed. There was general discussion that Part D (update historic preservation ordinance) needs to happen soon and that Parts A (historic resources data) and B (public engagement strategy) of the scope of services should be the foundation material for Part D. In addition, the Commission discussed that Part B is of critical importance to the overall success of the HPP.

Based on the previous discussion by the Landmarks Commission, below is an example of an alternate way that a consultant could address the scope of services and the priorities of the Landmarks Commission.

The consultant could propose to phase the parts of the Scope of Services as follows:

Phase 1 – Conduct public engagement strategies related to the 5 local historic districts (starting with Mansion Hill, then Third Lake Ridge, then University Heights, then Marquette Bungalows and finally First Settlement) and work toward the update of the historic preservation ordinance for those areas. Once this work is well underway, the consultant could begin Phase 2.

Phase 2 – Compile data and conduct public engagement strategies in areas of the city that have previously been surveyed.

Phase 3 – Compile data and conduct public engagement strategies in areas of the city constructed prior to 1950 that have not been surveyed.

Phase 4 – Compile data and conduct public engagement strategies in areas of the city that were constructed between 1950 and 1980.

The draft RFP reflects staff's expectations of major work tasks to be completed in preparing the HPP. Consultants will likely propose a variety of methods to achieve these tasks. It is typical of such processes that once a consultant is selected, staff will negotiate the scope of services with the consultants to ensure that the plan is completed in the most comprehensive and efficient manner possible given the available resources.

Please refer to the minutes related to the April 18, 2016 discussion of the Scope of Services document.

## **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Landmarks Commission review the attached document, discuss priorities in the scope of services, and make revisions to the draft language as necessary. The recommendation of the Landmarks Commission and the revised document will be forwarded to the Common Council.