

Notice of information regarding the Request for Proposals (“RFP”), Solicitation No. GOGA-EQU, to Lease Historic Equestrian Stables in Marin County, CA located within Golden Gate National Recreation Area (“Park”).

The National Park Service (“Service”) issued a RFP on November 1, 2013 soliciting proposals to lease three historic equestrian stables Muir Beach Stables, Draft Lease No. L-GOGA011-14 (“Muir Beach”), Rodeo Valley Stables, Draft Lease No. L-GOGA012-14 (“Rodeo Valley”), and Tennessee Valley Stable, Draft Lease No. L-GOGA013-14 (“Tennessee Valley”) (collectively known as “Draft Leases”) all located within Golden Gate National Recreation Area (“Park”). The Service stated it would respond to questions regarding the RFP if submitted in writing and received by November 21, 2013. A number of questions have been received timely, and the Service has responded to the questions below, additionally, the Service has modified certain elements of the Draft Leases and RFP, as identified in the last section of the this document.

MODIFICATION #2

GENERAL QUESTIONS TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

No.	Section	Question & Response
1.	General Provisions	<p><u>Question:</u> “If the requests are in by Jan. 30 how long before they make their announcement to the new contract?”</p> <p><u>Service Response:</u> The Service expects to announce the selection of the successful Lessee for each Draft Lease within 120 days following the RFP Proposal deadline. The commencement date of each Draft Lease may be altered as necessary.</p>
2.	General Provisions	<p><u>Question:</u> “What happens if none of they (sic) bids are acceptable to what the NPS is looking for? Or there are no bids?”</p> <p><u>Service Response:</u> If the Service does not receive any responsive proposals or there are no proposals, the Service will consider alternatives for the future use of the properties consistent with the Marin Equestrian Stables Plan and the Park’s General Management Plan. These options may include reissuing a new RFP or non-equestrian uses of the properties.</p>
3.	General Provisions	<p><u>Question:</u> “What is NPS’s plan if the lease terms offered in the current draft of the RFP prove to be not viable to a lessee of the Rodeo Valley Stables? What if the proposed lease terms are so unrealistic they do not result in any proposal?”</p> <p><u>Service Response:</u> See the Service’s Response to Question 2 above.</p>
4.	General Provisions	<p><u>Question:</u> “What happens if no one responds adequately to the RFP for the Golden Gate Dairy? (L-GOGA011-14). See Request for Proposal, p. 4.”</p> <p><u>Service Response:</u> See the Service’s response to Question 2 above.</p>
5.	Section A.2. (Use of Leased Property)	<p><u>Question:</u> “Are there any public program activities which are specifically prohibited? (RFP at 1)”</p> <p><u>Service Response:</u> All public programs are subject to Service approval, as stated in each Draft Lease.</p>

6.	Section A.2. (Use of Leased Property)	<p>Question: “If trail rides will be offered as one of the public programs, will certain trails be set aside as dedicated bridle paths to protect unskilled riders in the current multi-use environment (bicycles, runners, etc.)? (RFP at 1)”</p> <p>Service Response: Trail designations are provided on the attached map (Attachment C, Marin Headlands Trail Map). The Service is not planning to change trail designations.</p>
7.	Section A.2. (Use of Leased Property)	<p>Question: “If trail rides are offered to the public, what trails, if any, will be identified for high use to accommodate these riders? (RFP at 1).”</p> <p>Service Response: See the Service’s response to Question 7 above.</p>
8.	Section A.2. (Use of Leased Property)	<p>Question: “Section A.2.c. (page 2) of the RFP states: ‘Capacity: The maximum horse capacity for the stables ranges from 11 to 42 horses, depending on property size.’ My question is this: Will NPS provide the ratio or formula relied upon by NPS that determines the maximum horse capacity relative to property size? Will NPS also provide the ratios as used to determine the number of horses contemplated at Tennessee Valley?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI) and Errata was the methodology used to establish the number of horses at each property. These documents were completed and issued in August 2013 and are available at the following website: http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=303&projectID=14568&documentID=55278</p>
9.	Section A.7. (Site Tour, Pre-Submittal Conference and Q&A Period)	<p>Question: “What is the date (Schedule page 2 RFP) by which NPS expects to provide responses to these questions? If any of the questions cannot be answered in a timely manner, will the deadline for submitting responses to the RFP be extended?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Service may adjust the Proposal submission date if necessary to accommodate any potential delays.</p>
10.	Section D (Proposal Content)	<p>Question: “The RFP provides specific page limits on the submission relative to each of the five criteria submittals. Can submissions have appendices with additional detail or will such additional pages be counted toward the specified page limits?”</p> <p>Service Response: Appendices or additional attachments will count towards the page limit identified for each of the Criterion.</p>
11.	Section D (Proposal Content), Criterion 5	<p>Question: “What is the impact to construction within existing buildings on historical status?”</p> <p>Service Response: Construction within historic buildings is considered “Rehabilitation” as described by the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Treatment of Historic Structures. Proposed construction within existing historic buildings will require Service review for compliance with National Historic Preservation Act. The Service provided “Historic Site Treatment Reports” which provide treatment guidelines as Appendices to the RFP for each of the Draft Leases.</p>

12.	Section E (Service Evaluation and Selection of the Best Proposal)	<p>Question: “Will the RFP responses be scored and will both the responses and the individual scores be made publicly available?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Service will evaluate each responsive proposal with respect to the selection criteria set forth in the RFP. As stated in Section G (Confidentiality of Proposals) the Service may be required to disclose proposals in response to the RFP in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. §552). Requests for any other documents will be handled in accordance with Applicable Laws including Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).</p>
13.	Section G (Confidentiality of Proposals)	<p>Question: “Given the possibility of claiming confidentiality, how will NPS insure the process is transparent?”</p> <p>Service Response: Refer to the response to Question 13 above.</p>
14.	Attachment C (Financial Capability Information)	<p>Question: “We were wondering if the sample spreadsheets on pages 24-27 of the RFP are available as Excel spreadsheets? As PDFs they are difficult to read.”</p> <p>Service Response: The sample spreadsheets were provided as Modification 1 and are now available for download at the following websites: http://www.nps.gov/goga/parkmgmt/rfpdownload.htm and the Commercial Services website at http://www.concessions.nps.gov/.</p>
15.	Draft Leases, Section 14 (Hazardous Materials)	<p>Question: “Under what circumstances will Lessor indemnify Lessee for the clean-up of preexisting hazardous materials discovered on the property? (App. B-2, Section 14).”</p> <p>Service Response: There are no provisions in the Draft Leases in which the Lessor indemnifies the Lessee. Please refer to the specific Draft Leases for language regarding Hazardous Materials. Under Section 14(d) of the Draft Leases, the Lessee is responsible for the abatement of Hazardous Materials (which includes Pre-existing Hazardous Materials) in accordance with Applicable Laws. Thus, by way of example and without limiting the language in the Draft Leases, if abatement of Hazardous Materials is required under Applicable Laws in connection with improvements that Lessee intends to make, such as addressing lead-based paint or asbestos that might be present in buildings, such abatement in accordance with Applicable Laws is the responsibility of the Lessee at its expense. Section 14(e) also sets forth the obligation of the Lessee to indemnify including for causing the exacerbation or migration of Pre-existing Hazardous Materials or additional damage beyond Pre-existing Hazardous Materials. If Lessee encounters evidence of Pre-existing Hazardous Materials, Lessee must immediately notify the Lessor and take all precautions and actions necessary to insure that any suspected Pre-existing Hazardous Materials are not disturbed or exacerbated.</p> <p>In order to clarify the Lessee's responsibility under Section 14(d), the Service is also amending each Draft Lease as follows:</p> <p>Section 14(f), insert at the end of the last sentence in each Section 14(f): "... , and except as arising under Lessee's obligations under Section 14(d)."</p>

16.	Draft Leases, Exhibit B, Section III.A (Water Quality)	<p>Question: “With regard to monitoring water quality, what does the NPS have in mind when it says ‘perform regular, scheduled, water quality monitoring to test for bacteria, nitrates, pH, and total dissolved solids downstream of the stables? (App. B-2 at Page B-7).’ What specific tests does NPS have in mind? How frequently should the testing be performed? Will NPS conduct the same testing for the TVMP horses? Will there be water quality limits identified by NPS? Does NPS have any guidance that lessee can review? What testing and on what frequency does NPS conduct at the NPS stables in the Presidio?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Service will work with Lessee to develop monitoring protocols in accordance with the San Francisco Bay Area Network Freshwater Quality Monitoring Protocol, provided as Attachment D to this Modification.</p> <p>The Service will review testing results annually and may work with Lessee to modify Best Management Practices if testing results reveal unhealthy levels of bacteria or other contaminants.</p>
17.	Draft Leases, Exhibit B, Section III.A (Water Quality)	<p>Question: “What is meant by regular, scheduled water quality monitoring?”</p> <p>Service Response: Regularly scheduled monitoring needs to be determined by the Lessee in coordination with the Service.</p>
18.	Draft Leases, Exhibit B, Section III.D (Manage Stables Operations)	<p>Question: “The lease includes the requirement that Lessee ‘utilize Weed Free Forage.’ Does the NPS stable in the Presidio use Weed Free Forage? If so, where does it obtain such Forage?”</p> <p>Service Response: The NPS stables in the Presidio are not located in Marin and therefore the Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment does not apply. Draft Leases require the use of Weed Free Forage and Bedding, per the Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment, unless reviewed and approved by the Service, which is the responsibility of the Lessee to obtain.</p>
19.	Draft Leases, Exhibit B, Section III.D (Manage Stables Operations)	<p>Question: “Regarding the required use of ‘Weed Free Forage,’ research suggests the risk of introducing non-native plants through normal hay is low.¹ It also appears farmers use more pesticides in order to grow ‘Weed Free Forage.’² Indeed, some facilities will not accept the manure from facilities using ‘Weed Free Forage’ because of the increased pesticide load.³ What is the research NPS is relying upon to conclude that best management practices warrant the imposition of this requirement?”</p> <p>¹ See http://www.americantrails.org/resources/wildlife/horseenvironment.html.</p> <p>² See http://www.caes.uga.edu/commodities/fieldcrops/forages/pests/pastweed11.pdf.</p> <p>³ See http://www.ces.ncsu.edu/fletcher/programs/ncorganic/special-pubs/herbicide_carryover.pdf.”</p> <p>Service Response: The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment was the basis for the requirement for the use of Weed Free Forage.</p>
20.	Draft Leases, Exhibit B, Section III.D (Manage Stables Operations)	<p>Question: “So far we have not found weed free hay in California. Where does the NPS get the weed free hay that is used in the mounted patrol facility in San Francisco?”</p> <p>Service Response: Refer to the response in Question 19.</p>
21.	Draft Leases, Exhibit B, Section III.D (Manage Stables Operations)	<p>Question: “Do the park patrol horses stabled in the Presidio receive weed free hay?”</p> <p>Service Response: Refer to the response in Question 19.</p>

22.	Draft Leases, Exhibit B, Section III.E (Enhance Stables Safety)	<p>Question: “Are there alternatives to separating the combustibles from the horses in separate buildings?”</p> <p>Service Response: The requirements for fire safety are identified in each Draft Lease (provided as Appendix B-1, B-2 and B-3) Exhibit A, Section III.E (Enhance Stables Safety). The Service will not accept alternatives to the Best Management Practices as set forth in the RFP.</p>
-----	---	--

MUIR BEACH STABLES (LEASE NO. L-GOGA011-14)

23.	Appendix A-1, Section D (Land Assignment)	<p>Question: “How far back does the land assignment go to the North?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Premises extends 180 feet to the northeast of the northwest corner of Shed MB-105.</p>
24.	Appendix A-1, Section D (Land Assignment)	<p>Question: “The map of the lease property that is presented appears radically smaller than that set forth in the Marin Equestrian Plan, Option B-2. That map definitely shows room for the required lunging ring at the north end of the property while the map shown in the RFP does not. Our planning and assumptions are based on the map used during the discussion and planning phase leading up the release of the RFP, which was used at all public comment sessions and on which public comments were based. Please inform us specifically what objections there are to the original map.”</p> <p>Service Response: The North boundary of the Premises is 180 feet to the northeast of the northwest corner of Shed MB-105. This is consistent with the planning maps provided as part of the Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment (Preferred Alternative).</p>
25.	Appendix A-1, Section D (Land Assignment)	<p>Question: “Is the lessee responsible for re-planting the cypress windbreak at the north end of the property? Can it be moved to the new boundary line or does it need to remain in present location between present boundary and lessee's boundary?”</p> <p>Service Response: Per the Draft Lease, Section 12.1 (Lessee’s Responsibilities), Lessee will be responsible for maintenance of windbreaks, including replacement when necessary. The cypress windbreak at the north end of the property boundary may be removed and replanted with the new location shifted northward. Such relocation could vary from the current location by no more than fifteen (15) feet from the windbreak’s current location.</p>
26.	Appendix A-1, Section D (Land Assignment)	<p>Question: “Where on the property of the Golden Gate Dairy is parking for boarders and visitors to be located?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Draft Lease does not designate a specific location where such parking must be located. On pages 41-42 of Appendix C-1 (Cultural Resource Reports and Site Treatment) the Service has provided treatment recommendations and appropriate locations for parking, which could include trailer parking or vehicle parking. It is the responsibility of the Lessee to make the final determination where parking for boarders and visitors should be located.</p>

27.	Appendix A-1, Section G (Required Real Property Improvements)	<p>Question: “We understand and support the future plan for the Residence at the GGD to be used for community events. If that is the case, could the required ADA accessible bathroom and parking be located at the ground level of the Residence?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Lessee is expected to provide the accessible toilet facilities within the Premises, as required by the Draft Lease.</p>
28.	Appendix A-1, Section G (Required Real Property Improvements)	<p>Question: “Would a covered arena at another location, such as across Highway One from the GGD in the area that is currently a staging area for the Redwood Creek renovation or in Santos Meadow on State Park land meet the lease requirement for a covered arena?”</p> <p>Service Response: Offeror may propose to meet the Draft Lease requirement at an off-site location in the vicinity of the Property, provided that Offeror demonstrate that the proposed location meets the needs of providing a convenient area for daily horse exercise and all-year programming and that the Offeror will have rights to use such off-site location. The Service will not approve use of any other Service lands outside of the Premises identified in the Draft Lease.</p>
29.	Appendix C-1 (Cultural Resource Reports and Site Treatments)	<p>Question: “Can NPS please clarify where historic concrete is located at Muir Beach Stables and whether stalls or paddocks may be installed on top of it? If not, where could new stalls be constructed?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Internal Ranch Road (identified as the hatch-marked area on the site plan included in Appendix C-1, pg. 90) is considered a historical contributing feature. This space must retain its open quality and be free of structures or paddocks. Other patches or areas of concrete or asphalt that may exist within the Premises are not considered to be contributing features and could be considered for removal.</p> <p>With the exception of the Internal Ranch Road discussed above, the remaining areas north and northwest of MB-105 and extending to the boundary of the Premises, would be suitable for stalls or paddocks provided that such features are located outside of the riparian setback. It is permissible for Lessee to remove the existing windbreak (cypress trees) north of the existing equestrian stalls, and re-plant a replacement windbreak several yards further north in order to better accommodate stalls or paddocks.</p>
30.	Appendix C-1 (Cultural Resource Reports and Site Treatments)	<p>Question: “We propose to use the historic concrete cow path at the Golden Gate Dairy on a regular basis for agricultural purposes and ADA access, thereby preserving both its historical use and the circulation pattern at the dairy. What kinds of preservation, upgrades or modifications can be made to the surface?”</p> <p>Service Response: As stated in Appendix C-1 (Cultural Resource Reports and Site Treatments), page 31, any modifications to the historic concrete must be performed in consultation with the Park’s historical landscape architect.</p>

31.	Appendix C-1 (Cultural Resource Reports and Site Treatments)	<p>Question: “Is horse trailer parking permitted in front of the residence? Is it permanent or temporary parking that is allowed parallel to the hay barn?”</p> <p>Service Response: The area south of the residence is outside the Premises and will not be approved for trailer parking. The Draft Lease does not restrict whether parking parallel to the hay barn (MB-102), along the Interior Ranch Road, is restricted to permanent (long-term) or temporary (short-term) parking.</p>
-----	---	--

RODEO VALLEY STABLES (LEASE NO. L-GOGA012-14)

32.	Appendix A-2, Section C (Real Property Improvements Assigned)	<p>Question: “Can the NPS provide as-built drawings for the facility?”</p> <p>Service Response: The design drawings for Rodeo Valley Stables are provided as Attachment G, Rodeo Valley Stables Facility Plan Records.</p>
33.	Appendix A-2, Section C (Real Property Improvements Assigned)	<p>Question: “What is the estimated size of the new Covered lunging Ring (illustrated on Land Assignment Map, page A2-4).”</p> <p>Service Response: The new Covered Lunging Ring is expected to be round measuring approximately 50-60 ft. in diameter.</p>
34.	Appendix A-2, Section C (Real Property Improvements Assigned)	<p>Question: “Will animal proof recycling and trash containers be part of the public parking area (App A-1 Section I.B) which is designated to be constructed by the NPS?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Service does not intend to install recycling and trash containers in the public parking area.</p>
35.	Appendix A-2, Section D (Land Assignment)	<p>Question: “Can NPS please clarify the boundary between Park Horse Patrol and Lessee assigned areas in Building 902?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Service notes this written response corrects information that was verbally provided during the 11/14/2013 Rodeo Valley Stables site visit.</p> <p>The roof lines of building FA902 divide the building into three distinct sections with a drop in roof height between each section. The Northern one-third of FA902, delineated by the drop in roof height and four north-facing stalls, will be occupied by the Park horse patrol. The southern two-thirds of FA902, beginning with four southern-facing stalls, will be assigned to the Lessee as part of its Premises.</p>
36.	Appendix A-2, Section D (Land Assignment)	<p>Question: “The former balloon hanger has been identified in the RFP as a storage facility for NPS trucks and heavy equipment. What is the amount of heavy machinery traffic expected to and from this facility?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Balloon Hangar, via the coastal trail, is expected to be accessed intermittently throughout the year on an as-needed basis; the Service is unable to provide a specific schedule.</p>

37.	Appendix A-2, Section D (Land Assignment)	<p>Question: “What will the frequency of truck/equipment movement be on the coastal trail, as vehicles access the balloon hanger? Will any accommodation be made to separate the vehicle traffic from hiking/biking/and horse traffic accessing the trail?”</p> <p>Service Response: Please see the response to Question 36 above regarding the frequency of access for the Balloon Hanger and costal trail. The Service will work with the Lessee if heavy traffic is anticipated. No special accommodations are planned to separate trail users from vehicle traffic.</p>
38.	Appendix A-2, Section D (Land Assignment)	<p>Question: “What will the hours of operation be of the equipment yard? The hours and level of usage of the equipment yard will directly impact what public programs are offered given that sudden noises coming from the equipment yard could frighten horses and endanger public program participants.”</p> <p>Service Response: The majority of operations are anticipated Monday-Friday between the hours of 7:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.</p>
39.	Appendix A-2, Section D (Land Assignment)	<p>Question: “What is the status of the alleged endangered red legged frog habitat previously identified on the West side of the facility (FA-901)?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment FONSI and Errata, completed and issued in August 2013, found no evidence of endangered red legged frog breeding habitat in the immediate vicinity of the Premises. This area is not designated as Critical Habitat.</p>
40.	Appendix A-2, Section D (Land Assignment)	<p>Question: “The RFP makes no provision for the possible presence of the endangered red legged frog. Can Lessee assume that NPS has concluded that no special measures must be taken to avoid areas previously identified as potential endangered red legged frog habitat and that this is no longer an issue?”</p> <p>Service Response: Areas previously identified as wetland in the Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment FONSI and Errata will be unavailable for new construction under the Draft Lease. Other use, such as passage for building access, may be considered by the Service.</p>
41.	Appendix A-2, Section D (Land Assignment)	<p>Question: “Given the possible existence of endangered species habitat, can the Lessee expect any access to the West side of building 901 to do maintenance and other necessary activities? Will NPS require permitting before activities in this area can occur?”</p> <p>Service Response: No special measures or special permitting requirements are anticipated for Lessee to access areas to the West side of FA901 within the Premises.</p>
42.	Appendix A-2, Section D (Land Assignment)	<p>Question: “Can NPS provide maps showing the location of sewer lines and storm drains?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Service has attached a map of the sewer lines and storm drains for Rodeo Valley Stables (L-GOGA012-14) as Attachment E to this Modification.</p>

43.	Appendix A-2, Section G(1)(b) (Required Real Property Improvements) and Draft Lease, L-GOGA012-14, Section 10.1(b)	<p>Question: “Given the two fire hydrants at the facility, is there any need for the generator and pumps? If so, what is purpose of this real property improvement?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Service has amended Appendix A-2 and the Draft Lease (L-GOGA012-14) for Rodeo Valley Stables as follows:</p> <p>The Service has amended the Draft Lease (L-GOGA012-14), Section 10.1(b) for Rodeo Valley Stables and Appendix A-2, Section G(1)(b) (Real Property Improvements) as follows: Delete “Installation of emergency backup generator, pump, and fire hose.”</p>
44.	Appendix A-2, Section G (Required Real Property Improvements)	<p>Question: “The RFP requires certain Real Property Improvements within the first two years of the lease and estimates the cost of these improvements to be approximately \$20,000 - \$25,000. (App A-2 at page A2-5). What is the basis for this estimate? Can NPS provide any estimates or additional materials that support this estimate?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Service completed Class C cost estimates, provided by a professional cost estimator and based on the scope of work, as provided in the RFP. Potential Offerors are responsible for producing their own prospective financial analyses.</p>
45.	Appendix A-2, Section G (Required Real Property Improvements)	<p>Question: “RFP Appendix A1 at page A2-5 references App B-3 (the lease for Tennessee Valley Stables) regarding water quality improvements required of Lessee. This was a typographical error and should have referenced App. B-2 (the lease for Rodeo Valley Stables), correct?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Service has amended this section as noted below:</p> <p>Amend the reference to “Appendix B-3: Sample Lease” in Appendix A-2, Section G.1.a to “Appendix B-2: Sample Lease”</p>
46.	Appendix A-2, Section G (Required Real Property Improvements)	<p>Question: “What specific improvements does NPS have planned to accommodate the TVMP (Tennessee Valley Mounted Patrol) horses at the Rodeo Valley Stables (App A-2 “NPS use”), including any changes to fence lines, anticipated drainage improvement in the paddocks as well as in and around the balloon hanger? This information is requested so lessee can prepare an integrated water management plan for the site.”</p> <p>Service Response: The Service has provided Rodeo Valley NPS Drainage Improvement Conceptual Plan as Attachment F.</p>
47.	Appendix A-2, Section G (Required Real Property Improvements)	<p>Question: “Will a sewer connection be installed at the facility for TVMP/NPS personnel (App A-2 “NPS use”)? Will the facility be open to the public or just NPS staff?”</p> <p>Service Response: The areas identified for Service use will only be available to Service and volunteer staff and not open to the public. Regarding improvements to the Premises please refer to the response to Question 46 above.</p>
48.	Appendix B-2, Section 6.1(a) (Authorized Uses)	<p>Question: “The Lease requires a specified number of horse trailers to be kept on the property but the maximum number is not provided (or at least we could not find it). (App B-2 at page B-9) What is the maximum number? Where is the designated trailer parking location?”</p> <p>Service Response: Please refer to Appendix B-2, Section 6.1 (e) for maximum number of horse trailers permitted.</p>

49.	Appendix B-2, Section 6.1(c) (Shared Use of Premises)	<p>Question: “The RFP contemplates Lessee and the Tennessee Valley Mounted Patrol (“TVMP”) will share space. Does NPS contemplate TVMP and Lessee will pool resources?”</p> <p>Service Response: RFP does not require pooled resources between Lessee and NPS Park Horse Patrol (“Park Horse Patrol”) (referred to as “TVMP” in the question above). As described in Appendix B-2, Section 6.1 (c), Lessee and Park Horse Patrol will work together to develop a Shared Use Plan, which, at the option of both parties, may include shared resources or operational efficiencies, such as shared delivery of hay and feed, and feeding or maintenance responsibilities, among others.</p>
50.	Appendix B-2, Section 6.1(c) (Shared Use of Premises)	<p>Question: “Does NPS contemplate that Lessee and TVMP will share utilities, responsibilities for maintaining the facilities, providing “Twenty-four Hour Supervision of horses” or any other activities associated with the Facilities? If so, what activities and how?”</p> <p>Service Response: Refer to the responses to Questions 46 and 49 above.</p>
51.	Appendix B-2, Section 6.1(c) (Shared Use of Premises)	<p>Question: “How will Lessee and TVMP share responsibility for Shared Use Facilities and Grounds relating to Best Management Practices Requirements and Methods for Water Quality and Control of Erosion and Sediment?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Service will be responsible for initial installation of site drainage Best Management Practices (BMPs) in Shared Use Facilities and grounds. As described in Appendix B-2, Section 6.1 (c), Lessee and Park Horse Patrol will work together to develop a Shared Use Plan. Procedures and maintenance for shared facilities BMPs will be determined within this Shared Use Plan.</p>
52.	Appendix B-2, Section 11.8 (Administrative Costs)	<p>Question: “The RFP notes that administrative costs will be imposed on lessee and estimates that such charges have generally ranged from 3-5% of project net construction costs. (RFP at 3-4) Can Lessee assume administrative costs will not exceed a maximum percentage of expected overall costs?”</p> <p>Service Response: The range for Administrative Costs provided in the RFP of 3.0% to 5.0% is provided to Offerors as an estimate. This range is based on historic Park projects as well as comparable costs for planning, permitting, and inspection charges levied by local agencies adjacent to the Park. Offerors should note the Draft Lease requires Lessee’s to pay the actual Administrative Costs and no maximum percentage can be guaranteed by the Service.</p>
53.	Appendix B-2, Section 12 (Maintenance and Repair)	<p>Question: “The Lease imposes substantial responsibilities on lessee. (See, e.g., App. B-2 at Section 12). Has NPS estimated the costs for maintenance and repair for the term of the Lease? If so, what are its estimates?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Service’s determination of fair market value is made in accordance with 36 C.F.R. Section 18 et seq. It is the responsibility of the Offerors to determine maintenance estimates while developing its response package.</p>

54.	Appendix B-2, Section 14 (Hazardous Materials)	<p>Question: “Are there any known hazardous materials on the site? If so, what are they?”</p> <p>Service Response: Asbestos has been identified on building interiors and exteriors and an abandoned gasoline piping remains on the north side of the Premises from previous Army use.</p> <p>As with all buildings from this era, Lead Based Paint is suspected. These areas were actively used as an army installation and there is potential for other hazardous materials on site. .</p>
55.	Appendix B-2, Exhibit B, Section III (Best Management Practices Management Requirements and Methods)	<p>Question: “Among the real property improvements specified in the RFP are water quality improvements that include phasing out the use of any Animal Use Areas within 50 feet of creeks or wetlands. (Ex. B-2 at page B-6). Are any of the Animal Use Areas at Rodeo Valley within 50 feet of creeks or wetlands? If yes, which ones? If yes, must Lessee cease to use these areas within 2 years? If so, will alternative Animal Use Areas be provided by NPS?”</p> <p>Service Response: There are no seasonal creeks within 50 feet of building FA901, FA902, or current Animal Use Areas within the Premises.</p> <p>The Service has amended the Draft Lease, L-GOGA012-14, (Rodeo Valley), Exhibit B, Section III (A)(2) 3rd bullet as follows:</p> <p>Replace current 3rd bullet labeled “<i>To maintain setbacks</i>” with the following corrected bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>To maintain setbacks:</i> Utilize Exclusion Fencing; eliminate or phase out use of any Animal Use Areas within 50 feet of seasonal creeks.
56.	Appendix B-2, Exhibit B, Section III (Best Management Practices Management Requirements and Methods)	<p>Question: “Can lessee assume covered manure (App B-7 C), which will be hauled away weekly and will be dry, does not need to be discharged into a bio-filter?”</p> <p>Service Response: The covered manure structure will not need a dedicated bio-filter.</p>

TENNESSEE VALLEY STABLES (LEASE NO. L-GOGA013-14)

57.	Site visit observation, South of TV-101	<p>Question: “South of TV-101, what is the fenced off depression in the ground with a sign marking it that read “Keep Out”?”</p> <p>Service Response: The area pictured below is a fenced off sink hole which is believed to be due to an abandoned septic system for TV-101.</p> 
58.	Site visit observation, North of TV-105 and TV-109	<p>Question: “The concrete area North of TV-105 and breezeway does not appear to be original. Has this been replaced?”</p> <p>Service Response: The eastern half of this historic concrete area, beginning on the Eastern side of the breezeway and extending to TV-105, was replaced in 2011. The section in front of the breezeway was replaced at an accessible grade to create an accessible drop-off area, and creating an accessible path of travel across the concrete to the breezeway entrance in order to facilitate future connections to additional accessible routes within the Premises.</p>
59.	Site visit observation	<p>Question: “What is the water source for this stable?”</p> <p>Service Response: Non-potable water is sourced from two springs uphill from Property, and is gravity fed to the stables. The stables contain two 5,000 gallon water tanks. The first water tank, identified in Appendix A-3, Section D, is south of the main stables property. The second water tank is adjacent to TV-102 within the Premises.</p>
60.	Site visit observation	<p>Question: “What changes will need to take place around Building TV-107?”</p> <p>Service Response: Horses must be removed from TV-106 because this facility is within the riparian setback. The small building and cement pad next to TV-107, identified in Appendix A-3, Section G.4 items b and c, must be removed by Lessee.</p>

61.	Appendix A-3, Section G (Required Real Property Improvements)	<p>Question: “What is the time frame for implementation of the horse removal from the buildings next to water and removal of old building/pad?”</p> <p>Service Response: Regarding the removal of horses from buildings within the Riparian Setback, Offerors should review all minimum Best Management Practices as responses to Criterion questions are developed. For Required Real Property Improvements, per Appendix A-3, Section G, these must be implemented within three (3) years of the Draft Lease effective date.</p>
62.	Appendix B-3, Exhibit B, Section III.A.1.e. (Water Quality)	<p>Question: “When do the horses have to be out of the calf barn (TV-107)? Is there a chance to be creative and move them or is this area not a place where horses can be stabled starting Sept.15 (2013, i.e. Lease Commencement Date).”</p> <p>Service Response: Refer to the Service’s response to Question 62 above.</p>
63.	Appendix B-3, Exhibit B, Section III.E (Enhance Stables Safety)	<p>Question: “Regarding a fire wall in Hay Barn: what is the required width or any other measurements?”</p> <p>Service Response: If the Lessee proposes to keep stalls and hay storage in the same building, it is the Lessee’s responsibility to identify appropriate fire safety design standards for NPS Fire Marshall approval and demonstrate how the Lessee will meet these standards, while complying with National Environmental Policy Act and National Historic Preservation Act.</p>

MARIN EQUESTRIAN PLAN, ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, AND ERRATA

64.	Appendix A-2 (Use of Leased Property)	<p>Question: “The RFP states at page 2 that the maximum number of horses is based on property size. What is the calculation methodology that resulted in the conclusion that horse capacity at Rodeo Stables shall not exceed 13 year -round horses? (App. B-2, at p 10)”</p> <p>Service Response: The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment FONSI and Errata was the methodology used to establish the number of horses at each property. These documents were completed and issued in August 2013 and are available at the website provided at the beginning of this Modification document.</p>
65.		<p>Question: “What criteria were used to establish the total horse limit for the Rodeo Valley Stable (App. B-2, at p 10)?”</p> <p>Service Response: The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment FONSI and Errata was the methodology used to establish the number of horses at each property. These documents were completed and issued in August 2013 and are available at the website provided at the beginning of this Modification document.</p>

66.		<p>Question: “Why has the decision been made to reduce the number of Lessee horses (RFP at 1) at the Rodeo Valley Stable to accommodate the Park Patrol horses being moved from the Lower Tennessee Valley Stable when both the Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment and the subsequent Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment Errata and Response To Comments August 2013 (Page E4 Table 2-8 Alternative B - Option B2) show an increased number of horses.”</p> <p>Service Response: This question refers to The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment FONSI and Errata, completed August, 2013. These documents are available at the website provided at the beginning of this Modification document in the response to Question 8.</p>
67.		<p>Question: “What specific analysis did NPS undertake to ensure that the size and programmatic requirements being applied to the Rodeo Valley Stables would not seriously impair the viability of operations of the stables?”</p> <p>Service Response: This question refers to The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment FONSI and Errata, completed August, 2013. These documents are available at the website provided at the beginning of this Modification document in the response to Question 8.</p>
68.		<p>Question: “If the lease terms prove to be not viable and there is no lessee to improve and maintain the site, is the basis of the NPS FONSI not in jeopardy?”</p> <p>Service Response: This question refers to The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment FONSI and Errata, completed August, 2013. These documents are available at the website provided at the beginning of this Modification document in the response to Question 8.</p>
69.		<p>Question: “How does reducing the number of year-round horses to 13 advance the NPS objective of enhancing recreational opportunities? (RFP at 1)”</p> <p>Service Response: This question refers to The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment FONSI and Errata, completed August, 2013. These documents are available at the website provided at the beginning of this Modification document in the response to Question 8.</p>

70.		<p>Question: “The unpopular and poorly supported decision to close the Lower Tennessee Valley stables is one that will continue to have unfortunate reverberations for a long time and this is just one of them. The rationale offered to the public for this expensive, disruptive and unnecessary move was summed up as “The National Park Service determined to relocate Park Horse Patrol from Lower Tennessee Valley and remove horse facilities at that location due to environmental issues and conformance with ongoing planning that will result in revisions to the Park’s General Management Plan.” Neither the vague “environmental issues” nor the “conformance with ongoing planning that will result in revisions to the Park’s General Management Plan” are satisfactory reasons to justify the impacts of this decision.</p> <p>My question is this: Am I reading the NPS justification correctly that this determination was based on planning that has not been completed and which planning may result in revisions to the Parks General Plan? Is that basis for a determination even legal? Would NPS direct members of the public to both the specific environmental issues as well as the incomplete planning efforts that may result in revisions to the Plan as well as what these potential revisions are?”</p> <p>Service Response: This question refers to The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment FONSI and Errata, completed August, 2013. These documents are available at the website provided at the beginning of this Modification document in the response to Question 8.</p>
71.		<p>Question: “On Page E14 in the Errata, NPS explains its reasoning for not locating the PHP at Tennessee Valley stating: “The National Park Service has determined to not locate the Park Horse Patrol program at the Tennessee Valley stables site. Of the Marin GGNRA stables analyzed in this EA, Tennessee Valley has the greatest number of horses and improved facilities. With 42 horses in the winter and 52 in the summer, TV is expected to remain the busiest of the sites. As the busiest site, the programming, operations, and business opportunity would be most impacted by two programs operating on a shared site. Although with the future leasing opportunity the operations at Tennessee Valley may change, it is likely any future operator will maximize the number of horses at the site. NPS concludes that not adding four additional horses will allow greater space and operational flexibility for the future operator.”</p> <p>My question is this? Isn’t the converse of this reasoning true? Won’t the programming operations and business opportunity be most impacted by reducing the lessees horse numbers on an even smaller operation by 1/3? Just as at Tennessee Valley, wouldn’t a future operator need to “Maximize the number of horses at the site”? What financial and programmatic analysis was done by NPS to determine whether or not this decision of reducing the number of lessees horses would lead to a failed enterprise at Rodeo Valley?”</p> <p>Service Response: This question refers to The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment FONSI and Errata, completed August, 2013. These documents are available at the website provided at the beginning of this Modification document in the response to Question 8.</p>

72.		<p>Question: “On Page E16 in the Errata, NPS is responding to a letter from the Presidio Riding Club who had expressed support for Alternative A, No Action. In NPS’s response they state: “Based on discussion with management and staff, the National Park Service will relocate Park Horse Patrol facilities to Rodeo Valley stables as the Selected Alternative.”</p> <p>My question is this: What was the discussion? What analysis was done to determine if this decision would result in an economically viable leasing option for Presidio Riding Club or any other lessee? What experts were consulted (business or programming) to determine the feasibility of this determination? Where can I find the minutes documenting this discussion with management and staff?”</p> <p>Service Response: This question refers to The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment FONSI and Errata, completed August, 2013. These documents are available at the website provided at the beginning of this Modification document in the response to Question 8.</p>
73.		<p>Question: “On page E17 in the Errata, the NPS states: “If permanent horses displace visiting horses in the current “horse hotel” stalls in the East Motor Vehicle Shed, visiting horses may stay outside in paddocks per the language in the Plan/EA.”</p> <p>My question is this: If it is determined that a lessee cannot operate a financially and programmatically viable operation under the terms of the proposed lease that reduce the total amount of lessee horses to 13, will the lessee be able to increase its number back to 19 lessee horses and use the horse hotel stalls? If it was acceptable to add PHP horses to Tennessee Valley in addition to the existing lessee horses, wouldn’t that be acceptable in this case as well?”</p> <p>Service Response: This question refers to The Marin Equestrian Stables Plan Environmental Assessment FONSI and Errata, completed August, 2013. These documents are available at the website provided at the beginning of this Modification document in the response to Question 8.</p>

MODIFICATIONS TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND DRAFT LEASES

APPENDIX A-1, Section D and Draft Lease, L-GOGA011-14 (Muir Beach), Exhibit A, Section II (Premises):

The Service has updated the land assignment maps originally provided in both the Appendix A-1 to the RFP and Exhibit A to the Draft Lease (L-GOGA011-14). The updated map is included as Attachment A to this Modification. The updated map corrects the current location of the outhouse outbuilding north of building MB-104 for the Muir Beach Stables (L-GOGA011-14). All other elements of both Appendix A-1 (e.g. Description, Real Property Improvements Assigned, Minimum Annual Rent, etc.) and Exhibit A, remain the same.

APPENDIX A-2, Section D and Draft Lease, L-GOGA012-14 (Rodeo Valley), Exhibit A, Section II (Premises):

The Service has updated the land assignment maps originally provided in both the Appendix A-2 to the RFP and Exhibit A to the Draft Lease (L-GOGA012-14). The updated map is included as Attachment B to this Modification. The updated map corrects the Stables Area Boundary at the eastern edge of the property for the Rodeo Valley Stables (L-GOGA012-14), and the fence line between Section 3 and Section 11. All other elements of Appendix A-2 (e.g. Description, Real Property Improvements Assigned, Minimum Annual Rent, etc.) and Exhibit A, remain the same.

APPENDIX A-2, Section G(1)(b) and APPENDIX B-2, Draft Lease, L-GOGA012- 14 (Rodeo Valley), Section 10.1(b):

The Service has amended the Draft Lease (L-GOGA012-14), Section 10.1(b) for Rodeo Valley Stables and

Appendix A-2, Section G(1)(b) (Real Property Improvements) as follows: Delete “Installation of emergency backup generator, pump, and fire hose.”

Draft Lease, L-GOGA011-14, Draft Lease, L-GOGA012-14, and Draft Lease, L-GOGA013-14, Section 14(f): Insert at the end of the last sentence in each Section 14(f): ", and except as arising under Lessee's obligations under Section 14(d)."

APPENDIX B-2, Draft Lease, L-GOGA012-14 (Rodeo Valley), Exhibit B, Section III, (A)(2) 3rd bullet:

Replace current 3rd bullet labeled “*To maintain setbacks*” with the following corrected bullet:

- “*To maintain setbacks*: Utilize Exclusion Fencing; eliminate or phase out use of any Animal Use Areas within 50 feet of seasonal creeks.”