

# Hellyer County Park National Register Nomination Project

---

## *Public Questions and Responses - Draft for Posting*

---

The following responses consolidate questions received from prospective consultants about the Hellyer County Park National Register of Historic Places nomination project.

These responses are intended to clarify the consultant solicitation.

### **1. How was the consultant fee established, and how will labor be shared among the consultant, CPF, SJSU, and project partners?**

**Response:** The anticipated consultant fee is up to \$15,000 and is contingent on final grant award. The scope was developed with the expectation that the selected consultant will lead preparation of the National Register nomination, while CPF, SJSU, and project partners contribute existing research, community context, student-produced research materials, oral histories, field notes, mapping, archival leads, and related documentation. A project partner has also offered to provide updated site photography. The consultant should describe how they would use partner-provided materials, identify any needed supplemental research, and allocate their work within the available fee.

### **2. How is CPF envisioning coordination with the SJSU oral history and research component?**

**Response:** The SJSU student research and oral history component is expected to be coordinated by SJSU faculty leads. Students will work under SJSU guidance to help schedule, conduct, and assemble oral histories and related research materials. CPF anticipates that the consultant's early role may be limited but could include a training session, course segment, or webinar introducing students to the National Register nomination process, research standards, documentation needs, and how oral histories and archival research can support a nomination.

### **3. How involved will the consultant be in guiding student-led interviews versus using them as a research source?**

**Response:** The student-produced work is expected to function as an important research source for the nomination, rather than replacing the consultant's professional judgment. The consultant will be responsible for reviewing, evaluating, and synthesizing the materials provided and for determining what additional research, documentation, verification, or context is needed to support the nomination. Proposers may suggest an approach for appropriate coordination with SJSU that helps align student work with the needs of the National Register nomination.

### **4. When will the consultant's core work begin, and is the timeline flexible?**

**Response:** CPF anticipates that the consultant's core nomination work will begin after the student research and oral history component has produced materials for review, likely in late summer or early fall. CPF recognizes that projects involving underdocumented community histories, oral histories, and community-based research may require flexibility. While the project must remain aligned with grant requirements and overall project deadlines, proposers may identify timeline concerns and recommend a realistic schedule for completing the nomination.

## 5. What is the primary historical focus of the nomination, and should earlier histories be addressed?

**Response:** The project is focused on Hellyer County Park's significance in Latinx and Chicano history, including its association with Chicano civil rights organizing, community identity, and the development of Lowrider culture in Northern California during the 1970s. Earlier and broader histories may also be relevant to establishing context, continuity, and significance. The final National Register areas of significance, criteria, and period of significance will need to be supported by research and evaluation.

## 6. What kinds of materials are expected from the SJSU and partner research component?

**Response:** CPF anticipates that materials may include oral histories, interview notes or transcripts, field notes, archival leads, mapping, draft narrative components, and other research products developed by SJSU, CPF, and community partners. The consultant should expect to review and synthesize these materials, assess their relevance and reliability, and incorporate them into the nomination as appropriate.

## 7. Will the consultant have an opportunity to review the goals, interview questions, or interviewee selection for the oral history work?

**Response:** CPF intends for coordination between the consultant, SJSU, and project partners to occur to the extent feasible, particularly where early guidance can improve the usefulness of the research for the nomination. The SJSU team will lead its student component, but CPF welcomes proposals that identify a practical and efficient way for the consultant to provide early input on research priorities, interview themes, documentation needs, and National Register framing.

## 8. Are there provisions for additional or supplemental oral history interviews if the student-produced interviews do not provide enough information?

**Response:** The consultant should evaluate the oral history materials received and identify any gaps that affect the nomination. Supplemental interviews or follow-up conversations may be proposed as part of the consultant's work plan, but no separate pool of funding is guaranteed unless approved within the project budget. Proposers should clearly state whether they anticipate additional interviews, what purpose those interviews would serve, and how the work would fit within the fee and schedule.

## 9. Will community partners be available to assist with oral history, archival research, or community context?

**Response:** Yes. The project is designed as a collaborative effort involving CPF, SJSU, the Preservation Action Council of San Jose, community historians, culture bearers, and other partners. Partners are expected to help provide research leads, community context, and access to knowledge that may not be well represented in conventional archives. The level of partner involvement will depend on availability, schedule, and the needs of the project.

## 10. Should proposers address Spanish-language materials, bilingual research needs, or transcription review?

**Response:** Yes. Because relevant materials and oral histories may include Spanish-language words, phrases, or sources, proposers should describe any experience with bilingual research, Spanish-language materials, oral history review, and transcription quality control. Reading familiarity with Spanish and sensitivity to community language use may strengthen a proposal, particularly where oral histories or community records require careful interpretation.

## 11. How should proposers treat limited archival documentation and underrecognized community histories?

**Response:** CPF recognizes that underrecognized histories are often poorly represented in traditional archives. The consultant should be prepared to work with a combination of archival sources, oral histories,

community-held knowledge, prior research, mapping, photographs, and partner-provided documentation. Proposals should demonstrate an understanding of how to build a rigorous National Register argument when conventional archival records are limited, while also maintaining professional standards for evidence, attribution, and evaluation. CPF also welcomes proposals that identify additional research leads, organizations, collections, or community knowledge holders that may help strengthen the nomination.