
ADDENDUM NUMBER 1

To the REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Issued by the:

FEDERALISM COMMISSION

**Consulting Services for the Development of
Land Management Plans
For Federally Controlled Public Land in Utah**

RFP No. FC-2019-02

**ADDENDUM # 1
January 6, 2020**

This Addendum modifies the Request for Proposals, RFP No. FC 2019-02 (“RFP”), issued by the Federalism Commission on December 18, 2019, as follows:

The RFP is modified and supplemented by the following additional information in response to the questions submitted before the question submission deadline under Section IV. 1 of the RFP:

Question 1: The RFP release coinciding with the holidays has limited the time available to provide a thoughtful and well-reasoned response. If possible, we would like an opportunity to improve the quality of our response to the Commission by requesting an extension to submit our proposal for the Commission's review.

Answer to Question 1: The deadline for submitting proposals in response to the RFP, as stated in Section IV. 3 of the RFP, is hereby changed to 12:00 noon MST on Monday, January 13, 2020.

Question 2: Does the cost proposal require a specific cover as well. If so, is there a title requirement for the cost proposal, similar to the technical proposal?

Answer to Question 2: There are no requirements for the separate Cost document, other than those stated in the RFP.

Question 3: Do the federally controlled public lands within the Bears Ears National Monument mean all of the lands so designated as a National Monument in 2016 by President Obama, or do they mean only the lands downsized in 2017 by President Trump into the Indian Creek Unit and Shash Jáa Unit (with the non-contiguous Doll House and Moon House Ruins)?

Answer to Question 3: “[F]ederally controlled public lands within the Bears Ears National Monument,” as used in Section I. 5 of the RFP, is intended to refer to the land described in the report issued by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service in July 2019, entitled “Bears Ears National Monument: Proposed Monument Management Plans and Final Environmental Impact Statement, Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units.”

Question 4: The Shash Jáa Unit of the Bears Ears National Monument includes lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service as part of the Monticello Ranger District of the Manti-La Sal National Forest of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The same may possibly hold true for the Indian Creek Unit. In light of this, should Section I. 4. a. of the RFP be amended to include the U.S. Forest Service.

Answer to Question 4: Section I. 4. a. of the RFP is hereby amended to add “or, as applicable, the U.S. Forest Service” after “the U.S. Department of the Interior.”

Question 5: Do the federally controlled public lands within the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument mean all of the lands so designated as a National Monument in 2016 by President Obama, or do they mean only the lands downsized in 2017 by President Trump into the Grand Staircase Unit, the Kaiparowits Unit and the Escalante Canyon Unit?

Answer to Question 5: “[F]ederally controlled public lands within . . . the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument,” as used in Section I. 5 of the RFP, is intended to refer to the land described in the report issued by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management in October 2019, entitled “Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument and Kanab-Escalante Planning Area Proposed Resource Management Plans and Final Environmental Impact Statement.”

Question 6: Do the federally controlled lands within Emery County mean the lands designated as wilderness in 2019 as part of the so-called Congressional Emery County Public Lands Act? Or do they mean other federally controlled public lands?

Answer to Question 6: “[F]ederally controlled public lands within . . . Emery County,” as used in Section I. 5 of the RFP, is intended to refer to the land described in the Emery County Public Land Management Act of 2018, enacted by Congress.

Question 7: The reference to federally controlled public lands within the Central Wasatch Range, does that mean certain wilderness areas and/or areas proposed for wilderness in the Unita-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, or does that mean other public lands? Could you please specify what lands are involved?

Answer to Question 7: “[F]ederally controlled public lands within . . . the Central Wasatch Range,” as used in Section I. 5 of the RFP, is intended to refer generally to land described in the November 1, 2019 draft of the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act, using current land designations. The description of that land may change, depending on what federal action, if any, is taken with respect to that land.

Question 8: Do you envision separate distinct land management plans, one each for the Bears Ears NM, the Grand Staircase-Escalante NM, lands in Emery County, and lands in the Central Wasatch Range (and for example, might there be more than one such plan for different units in the Central Wasatch Range)? Or do you envision one big omnibus land management plan for all such lands collectively?

Answer to Question 8: The COMMISSION anticipates a separate plan for each distinct area referred to in Section I. 5 of the RFP.

Question 9: Which state agency will be managing the development of or the consultant over the land management plan?

Answer to Question 9: The COMMISSION.

Question 10: What kind of public engagement is expected in this planning process?

Answer to Question 10: Please refer to Section II. 6 and Section II. 7 of the RFP. The CONSULTANT will not be expected to conduct an independent public engagement effort but will be expected to participate in public COMMISSION meetings where LAND MANAGEMENT PLANS and drafts of LAND MANAGEMENT PLANS will be considered.

Question 11: How does this land management plan differ from the state resource management plan? Page 4 of the RFP, point 5 states that Utah has not legislatively approved land management plans for federally controlled public lands within the state, what was the intent of the 2016/2017 county RMPs? Will the county RMPs developed in 2016/2017 be used or integrated in this plan or planning process?

Answer to Question 11: Please refer to Section II. 7 of the RFP. It is expected that the LAND MANAGEMENT PLANS will be as consistent as possible with the statewide resource management plans. Those plans are vision documents created by the Executive Branch. The LAND MANAGEMENT PLANS that will be developed with the assistance of the CONSULTANT are intended to be presented to and adopted by the Utah Legislature and are expected to attempt to implement the vision outlined in the statewide resource management plans.

Question 12: How many land management plans does the Commission intend to create?

Answer to Question 12: Four, one for each of the distinct areas referred to in Section I. 5 of the RFP.

Question 13: What are the anticipated elements included and covered in the Land Management Plans? What level of research is expected (e.g., new field studies and academic-level research)?

Answer to Question 13: The LAND MANAGEMENT PLANS that the CONSULTANT will assist the COMMISSION to develop should follow the same protocols and template as a federally developed land management plan. The goal is not to create new information or to conduct new research but to analyze existing data and use information contained in existing land management plans, to the extent possible and consistent with the state's policy objectives.

Information needed to develop LAND MANAGEMENT PLANS should be derived from existing sources, if possible.

Question 14: What is the anticipated budget for the plan or plans?

Answer to Question 14: As indicated in Section V. 3 of the RFP, a RESPONDER is required to submit a cost document that will provide the amount the RESPONDER will charge for the work described in the RFP. As described in the RFP, that cost amount will be used in evaluating a RESPONDER's proposal submitted in response to the RFP. Details of the arrangement between the COMMISSION and the CONSULTANT will be negotiated between the COMMISSION and the CONSULTANT and included in the contract between them.

Question 15: How long does the Commission expect the consulting engagement to be?

Answer to Question 15: The length of the contract will be negotiated between the COMMISSION and the CONSULTANT, subject to the provisions of the Utah Procurement Code.