



DIVISION OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS

CITY OF CULVER CITY

9770 CULVER BOULEVARD, CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA 90232-0507

September 11, 2025

AMENDMENT No. 02 to Request for Proposal
Culver City Community Cultural Plan

INTENT

This Amendment No. 02 to the subject RFP is issued prior to receipt of submittals (proposals) to provide changes and/or clarifications to the RFP. This document and its changes to RFP, Culver City Community Cultural Plan, have the full force and effect of the original RFP.

Please remember that Sally Unsworth, sally.unsworth@culvercity.org, remains the sole point of contact on all RFP matters.

QUESTIONS RECEIVED FROM PROPOSERS

- 1) The Research and Assessment section of the scope of work includes conducting “a cultural asset inventory/mapping.” Could you please clarify whether the "cultural asset map" requires actual map files (i.e., GIS-based or digital map files detailing physical locations of cultural assets) or whether a descriptive inventory (e.g., list/database) is desired (or both)?

Response: The City expects a descriptive inventory that can be presented in a database or list format, supplemented with mapping where feasible. GIS or digital mapping files are not required deliverables but may be proposed if the consultant considers them a useful tool for analysis or presentation.

- 2) Will the City expect that the public engagement process is leveraged to source inputs for the cultural asset inventory?

Response: Yes. While existing resources such as the General Plan and Parks Plan will be shared to streamline the work, community engagement may play an important role in surfacing less formal and intangible cultural assets, and the City encourages consultants to design processes that incorporate these perspectives.

- 3) Does the scope of the project call for a formal economic and/or fiscal impact analysis—with quantitative metrics and modeling—or is a narrative, qualitative discussion that leverages prior economic impact studies acceptable?

Response: A formal economic or fiscal impact analysis is not required. A qualitative discussion that draws upon existing Creative Economy studies and other relevant

data will be sufficient. Consultants may recommend further quantitative analysis as a potential future step.

- 4) We would like to confirm that the needs assessment in #2 (Research and Assessment) of the Scope of Services is the same/synchronous with the needs assessment included as part of #1 (public engagement).

Response: Yes. The needs assessment outlined in #2 is intended to build directly on the information gathered through the public engagement process in #1, resulting in a single, integrated analysis.

- 5) We would like to confirm that in 2a. under the Scope of Services “Benchmark best practices and promising practices...” and 2f. “perform a landscape analysis...” are two parts of the same contextual research.

Response: Yes. These are complementary components of the contextual research. Benchmarking best practices and performing a landscape analysis are both intended to inform the same overarching assessment of Culver City’s cultural ecosystem.

- 6) What data/metadata exists on the current public art collection? Is the consultant expected to conduct an inventory of existing public art for the public art master plan?

Response: The City maintains an inventory of its public art collection, including key data points such as artist, title, medium, year, and location. Consultants are not expected to conduct a new collection inventory but may reference and incorporate this existing information as needed.

- 7) What is the expected depth of the assessment of the maintenance/conservation of existing public art? E.g., Is the City expecting an audit conducted of discrete works for recommendations of what works require treatment or maintenance, or is a general/high-level evaluation of the collection's overall maintenance status sufficient?

Response: A general, high-level evaluation of the collection’s overall maintenance and conservation status is sufficient. A detailed audit of individual works is not required within this scope, but may be recommended as a future initiative.

- 8) Is the public art master plan intended to be and/or function as a stand-alone document or act as a section of the broader cultural equity plan?

Response: The Public Art Master Plan is intended to be a distinct but integrated component of the broader Community Cultural Equity Plan. It should stand on its own for reference while aligning with the vision and goals of the larger planning framework.