



Frequently Asked Questions and Answers

BLM Requests Bids to Manage Equestrian Facility in Virginia

The Federal Register shows Dean Gettinger, BLM, at telephone: 414-297-4421, email: dgettinger@blm.gov as the contact, however, the BLM website shows Martha Malik, telephone 414-297-1236, email: mmalik@blm.gov as the contact. Should questions be addressed to both?

Questions can be addressed to either individual.

Do the "Attachments" identified in the BLM website above comprise the complete solicitation?

Yes.

Does the application have to address each item in both websites text content and attachments, or, specifically just the items in the BLM website attachments?

The application must address all items identified in both the text description and the attachments.

Will interested parties be identified?

As stated in the Federal Register Notice, the identity of parties submitting comments on the proposed action may be made available. This information would require a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. Information on applicants (bidders) will not be available until after the bidding process is completed.

Is it possible to notify all current and future interested bidders of a given party's interest in being a sub-contractor for specific identified solicitation requirements?

No. The BLM does not provide the public with the identity of bidders or potential bidders before or during the bidding process.

Will the solicitation also be posted on Fbo.gov; beta.sam.gov; or gsa.gov?

No. As specified in the Federal Register Notice, the solicitation will be advertised in the Fairfax County Times in accordance with 43 CFR 2920.4. It is also posted on the blm.gov website.

What type of arrangement is in place for the current situation at Meadowood?

The existing arrangement at Meadowood is under a Special Recreation Permit (SRP) issued under 43 CFR 2930. The current permits are not in compliance with the BLM's policy (IM-2016-030). This policy was issued in response to the Office of the Inspector General's (OIG) Final Evaluation Report, "Review of Bureau of Land Management's Concession Practices", dated March 30, 2015.

Is the current arrangement available, and, is it available in any other means besides through a FOIA request?

Please see above question and answer.

Is extending the current arrangement being considered as an alternative to the competitive bid process?

No. The existing permits are not in compliance with current policy.

The Operating Plans and Maintenance Plans provided as attachments on the BLM website (<https://www.blm.gov/press-release/blm-requests-bids-manage-equestrian-facility-virginia>) give specific numbers of horses for various aspects of the operation as well as times for various activities. Is this what we are expected to submit?

No. The documents are only to serve as examples of the type and level of detail needed to evaluate the application and as a template for a format to use. Each applicant should submit their own plan that best meets their business needs.

If someone is an interested sub-contacting party not planning to be a prime bidder, and wishes to be identified to the public as an interested party, can this information be posted on the website and sent as a notification to current and future known prime bidders who may be looking for candidate subs for some parts of the solicitation?

No, the BLM will not be posting information on any interested parties to our website.

Must I submit a request under the Freedom of Information Act to obtain a copy of the existing Special Recreation Permit issued under 43 CFR 2930?

Yes.

Definitions are unclear, as in the following examples:

Maintenance Fund- page D2 Definitions- "A Lessee reserve account that is established in the main body of this Lease. MF may only be used to carry out Component Renewal on a project basis that is authorized in writing by the BLM and that is non-recurring within a seven year time frame. MF may not be expended to construct or install Capital Improvements." Based on this definition of the MF, it appears that money set aside for the fund can ONLY be used for repairs/maintenance that occur on average less than every 7 years. Is that the intention of the fund? Would that include items such as the entire fence line which would only need to be painted once during the life time of the lease? In other words, MF *cannot* be used for repair/maintenance of general items such as a broken water spigot?

Routine maintenance is not considered a Capital Improvement. Projects will be reviewed on case by case basis. On average the need to replace the same faucet multiple times in a seven year period is fairly unlikely.

If there are not enough repairs needed during the year to expend the allotted funds in the MF, does the fund zero out back to Lessee and a new balance start at the beginning of each year?

After the first year of operation the fund must have funds equivalent to 5% of gross receipts but not more than \$32,000. The funds will be spent down during the following year and at the end of the year must be brought back up to the 5% or \$32,000.

The MF shall be funded to the threshold of no more than \$32,000 per year regardless of gross income. Page 6 of Proposal Instructions states 5% of annual gross receipts. Which statement is correct?

The account must have 5% of annual gross receipts or \$32,000, whichever is less.

Proposal Instructions-Page 6, #6 states, “The Proposer agrees to at least the minimum Lease Fee of one tenth percent (0.1%) of the annual boarding gross receipts.”

This sentence was supposed to be removed from the document but was overlooked.

The Document Statistics page of the proposal documents in the first paragraph, reads, “The appraised rental value for the above-described land and equestrian facility is \$26,000 per year.” Elsewhere, the proposal documents says the offerer, “shall not submit any offer that is less than FMV.” Which rental boarding fee is to be used? Would it be the minimum of the FMV, or one-tenth percent as stated in the proposal instructions?

The Lessee will pay either a monthly or annual rental fee. That fee is based on the winning bid. The Government cannot accept a bid that is less than the appraised FMV of \$26,000 per year.

Personal Property Fee – Proposal Instruction page 6, #9 states, “The Proposer agrees to at least the minimum annual Personal Property fee of six tenths percent (0.6%) of annual gross receipts.” Using a fictitious amount of \$700,000 gross receipts: $700,000 \times 0.6 = 420,000$. Does the BLM intend the Proposer to have \$420,000 in a PP Fund? Or should the formula be $700,000 \times 0.006 = 4,200$?

The correct amount is .06%. It works in the same manner as the Maintenance Fund. At the end of the first year the fund must have .06% of annual gross receipts. The following year the fund is spent down and at the end of the year be brought back to .06% of the gross receipts.

The proposal reads as though the fees are assessed on the gross receipts of the prime contractor. If the prime contractor engages a subcontractor, are the fees also assessed on the gross receipts of the subcontractor? And if so, it would be on the gross receipts earned on the BLM property?

The leasee is not considered a contractor. This is not a contract. It is a lease. All fees are assessed to the leasee, only. If the leasee chooses to accomplish some of their work by contracting with another party (ie a sub-contractor), that is between those parties. The leasee will be assessed on their total receipts. The leasee's is only assessed on the receipts generated by their operation related to their lease with the BLM.

Page 6 of the Proposal Instructions and Package; 5.2 a requires the proposer to “provide audited financial statements for the most recent fiscal years, with all notes to the financial statements.” Audited financial statements are very expensive and time consuming. Are they required?

Audited reports are requested and highly encouraged. However, if you feel that it is cost prohibitive or for some reason can not be provided it will not disqualify your proposal.

Page 9 of the proposal instructions/package: Question 2.1.b “Ensure the following are included in the plan.” There is no following. It just goes onto point C.

This was an inadvertent omission. BLM is looking for a management plan that includes soil testing, approximate seeding schedule, fertilizing schedule, weed treatment, pasture rotation, stocking rates, use of external consultants.

When do you expect to make a decision after proposals are received?

Our intent is to move forward with a decision immediately after the bid period is over. The bid packages will undergo a review and rating by a technical review group. Based on their recommendation a decision will be made and the lease will be offered to the winning applicant. The time frame as it will depend the number of applications received and the schedules of the reviewing group.

Do you anticipate that there will be lessons, horse rentals, etc. for the public in the future?

The solicitation requires the leasee to provide boarding, horse riding lessons and therapeutic riding lessons to the public. It does not require the operator to rent horses (other than as part of their riding lessons program).