

# **City of Ojai Historic Resource Survey Update**

## **RFP Questions and Answers**

1. Is the City's request that all three phases of the prior survey, including the historic context statements, methodology, and survey of all city properties, be wholly redone?

**No, the expectation is not to redo the entire three phase survey.**

**The expectation is that the Historic Context (Phase I) be updated so it reflects the current knowledge and understanding of Ojai's history, and to include structures built from 1960 to 1985. The maps in Phase II Appendix A (Results and Methodology Report) will be updated to correlate with the addition of structures from 1960 to 1985. The updating of Phase III includes modifying the current recommendations in the survey if appropriate and adding properties constructed between 1960 to 1985.**

**A member of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) may assist the consultant to review and edit information in Phases I and III.**

2. Is there an expectation that the consultant draft registration requirements for local, state and federal level eligibility, relative to different property types or context statements?

**No. The intent of the Survey remains the same, which is a reconnaissance survey to be used as a tool for the Community Development Department, the HPC, and the community.**

3. Are there presently City concerns about Ojai eligibility Criteria wording, or any efforts to make eligibility Criteria stricter?

**No, there are no concerns regarding the methodology of the Survey or requirements of the Ojai Municipal Code regarding eligibility criteria.**

4. Is the assumption that every single property in the City - 45 years or older (either at the time of survey or at the projection completion date of the report), or a recent past property possessing potentially exceptional significance, will be surveyed/re-surveyed?

**The expectation is that every property within the specified years of construction be surveyed/resurveyed.**

5. The understanding is that the City possesses a property database already, relative to the earlier survey. Will you please tell me about the database, and is the consultant mandated to use it in the field for data collection purposes?

**The Community Development Department has the current Survey results on an Excel spreadsheet.**

6. For the forthcoming survey effort, does the City anticipate application of local eligibility criteria only, or application of California Register and National Register criteria also, along with assignment of California Historical Resource Status Codes?

**The current effort is a windshield survey adopting the current methodology to categorize properties and identify a potential historic resource.**

7. Will the City provide the date of construction?

**The Community Development Department has an excel spreadsheet provided by the County of Ventura of all structures that includes APN, zone, date of construction.**

8. Are DPR 523 forms anticipated as part of this RFP?

**The intent of the Update is to update the historical context, to include structures to 1985 and to update the survey utilizing the current methodology. DPR forms are not anticipated to be necessary for this exercise.**

9. Would the City like digital photos to be provided in this effort?

**Yes, digital photos would be appropriate for structures categorized as No. 1 in the Survey.**

10. Is there an assumption that the only properties surveyed will be those visible from the public right-of-way, or will the City either coordinate with property owners, or expect consultants to acquire PTE (permission to enter) unviewable properties?

**This is a windshield survey only. Therefore, the survey only includes what may be viewed from the public right of way.**

11. Is the assumption that the survey is only for buildings and potential districts of buildings, or is there an assumption that more peripheral elements will also be identified and evaluated (peripheral and smaller-scale structures; objects such as public artworks; landscapes and landscape elements; sites; infrastructure elements or linear resources such as roads, bridges, railroad segments, powerlines; historic archaeology, etc.)

**The survey is anticipated to include only structures however, if a potential district is observed it may be noted/included/discussed with staff and HPC.**

12. Is the expectation that the consultant will contextualize and identify all eligible properties, including properties that may be eligible for Ojai's social history, broad patterns, or significant persons?

**This Survey is identifying architectural integrity however, through consultation with the HPC, details including historic use or architect may be provided and included in the Survey.**

13. Does the City have a budget allocation for this project?

**The City requests the consultants respond with a scope including cost.**

14. Should community engagement be included in the proposed scope? Such as a community workshop or presentation to HPC or City Council about the scope of the project?

**The qualified Historian may expect to attend a couple of HPC public meetings throughout the process.**

15. What is the expectation for the final deliverable of the survey? Can a survey report include maps and spreadsheet?

**The expectation is that the Context be updated to include additional years 1960 to 1985, the survey data sheet be updated to include, exclude, update data, and update Survey maps.**

16. How does the HPC want/expect to be involved throughout the course of the project? Can commissioners (or select commissioners) serve as an “advisory group” and meet with the Consultant and Staff (outside of calendared public hearings) without complications with Brown Act?

**The expectation is that a designated HPC member provide historical context to the consultant. Meetings including up to two members of the HPC, staff, and consultant may occur throughout the course of the project.**

17. In the Phase III report, many of the properties listed in the table are blank in the “Cat” column. Why are these properties blank? Is it implied that they are/are treated as Category 3 and would require a Historic Resources Letter?

**It is not clear why the category is blank for some properties. It is possible that the structures were not visible from the public right of way.**

18. Will the prior 2011 survey data be available to the selected consultant in GIS or Excel format with locational data?

**Yes, the existing excel spreadsheet will be provided to the consultant.**

19. Can you clarify what you mean by including requirements for the preparation of historic reports for qualifying historic properties prior to potential alteration, restoration, demolition, etc.?

**Phase II of the existing Survey includes recommendations for the preparation of historic reports. This section of the Survey is not expected to be revised.**

Note to consultant - If your firm utilizes procedures that yield more useful results for a reconnaissance survey, without adding to the scope and depth of the existing survey, feel free to suggest these methods in your proposal.

#### **Update August 4, 2025**

20. The RFP states, “The survey will include a methodology used to determine inclusion in the Survey and recommend processes and procedures for potential alteration, preservation, restoration, demolition, etc.” Even though the 2011 survey was never formally adopted, the City honors the 2009/2011 identification and evaluation methodology, which will be the methodology the forthcoming update survey will “include” and use, correct?

**Yes, the update will include the existing methodology.**

21. Regarding the present organization of how and when to assign Phase I and Phase II Historic Resources Reports, and letter reports, please confirm that the City, as part of this RFP, is not asking the consultant to revise this system.

**That is correct. The is not looking to revise the current system.**

22. Does the City know how many non-vacant parcels it possesses with improved resources upon them dating from 1960 to 1985 and if so, what is this number for the whole City, and what is this number for the prior, windshield-visible survey area?

**The consultant will be determining the number of structures with building permits dating from '60 to '85.**

23. Insofar as what is windshield-visible may not be substantially different than 2009/2011, is the present assumption that the updated survey will generally correlate to the boundary areas of the prior reconnaissance survey?

**Referring to City boundaries? Yes.**

24. Please confirm that no aspect of this RFP is requesting a new evaluation or re-survey of pre-1960 Ojai properties.

**The properties previously surveyed shall be re-surveyed as part of this effort to determine their current integrity, etc.**

Let us know if you require further information.

Prepared by: Maura Macaluso, Principal Planner

[Maura.macaluso@ojai.ca.gov](mailto:Maura.macaluso@ojai.ca.gov)

805.646.5581 ext. 115