



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Ely Field Office
HC33 Box 33500 (702 N. Industrial Way)
Ely, Nevada 89301-9408
<http://www.nv.blm.gov>



JUL 21 2011

In Reply Refer to:
2710 (NVL00000)

REC'D - BLM - NSO

JUL 26 2011

9:00 A.M.

DECISION MEMORANDUM

To: Executive Committee

Through: Partners Working Group

From: FOR/Rosemary Thomas
District Manager *May D'Aren 7/21/11*

Subject: Request to Modify the Lincoln County Land Act (LCLA)/Lincoln County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Act (LCCRDA) Implementation Agreement

The Ely District Office, in coordination with the Partners Working Group, the BLM Nevada State Office, and other partners, is proposing changes to the *LCLA/LCCRDA Implementation Agreement* (IA) for Lincoln County Archaeological Initiative (LCAI), Archeological Resources Evaluation Category; Criterion III: Capability.

Executive Committee approval is required for criteria changes to the IA. Please review the recommended IA revision below and the attached supporting document.

Lincoln County Archaeological Initiative Criterion Revision

Background: The Archaeological Resources Team (ART) for LCAI is tasked with ranking proposals that are submitted under LCAI using approved ranking criteria. The ART also recommends new criteria or changes to existing ranking criteria. The ART met on November 30, 2010 to review, score and rank Round 4 proposals. The ART discussed ranking criteria and recommends a change to Criterion III be approved by the EC prior to the opening of Round 5.

The current IA language reads:

Criterion III: Capability (10 points possible):

“The proposal demonstrates specialized experience, equipment and facilities to carry out the proposal. The proposal identifies specialized experience, expert or specialized personnel, specialized services, equipment, and facilities to conduct the elements of the research and/or work plan. Federal agencies and local governments will be rated neutral (5 points)”.

Initially the ART recommended a neutral rating be included in Criterion III: Capability with the intent of ensuring fair competition between all entities as it was believed the government agencies would have a greater internal capability to complete projects. Following the Round 4 ranking, the ART determined that this neutral ranking put government agencies at a disadvantage as all proponents displayed similar capabilities to perform the nominated projects. BLM procurement staff confirmed that current regulations do not mandate this neutral ranking be used for Criterion III: Capability and recommend deleting this sentence from the criterion.

Recommendation: The Ely District recommends the changes outlined by the ART as stated above. Federal agencies and local governments would compete at the same level as all applicants. Federal agencies and local governments would be required to include applicable experience managing projects in their proposals. We are recommending that the IA be revised as noted. (See attached evaluation criteria)

Action Needed:

Partners Working Group members should vote on the above recommendation via email and/or voice vote during conference calls or meetings to Raul Morales, Chair of the Partners Working Group. Once all votes have been submitted or 14 days have passed, the Working Group's recommendation will be finalized by the Working Group Chair and forwarded to the Executive Committee for final decision.

Partners Working Group Decision: The signature below indicates the decision made by majority vote on the above Ely District Office recommendation.

BY: Raul Morales, Partners Working Group Chair



Approve Ely District Office Recommendation

7/29/11

Date

Approve Alternate Recommendation
(Refer to rationale provided below)

Date

Disapprove
(Refer to rationale provided below)

Date

If the Partners Working Group (PWG) disagrees with the Ely District Office recommendation and/or approves an alternate action, please explain below:

Executive Committee Decision: By signature below, indicate the decision made by majority vote on the above recommendation of the Partners Working Group (PWG).

BY: Amy Lueders, Executive Committee Chair

 **FOR**

Approve Above PWG Recommendation



Date

Disapprove PWG Recommendation
(Refer to rationale provided below.)

Date

If the Executive Committee disagrees with the Partners Working Group recommendation and/or approves an alternate action, please explain below:

The Executive Committee will notify the Partners Working Group of its decision and return the original signed document to the Ely District Office to be maintained in the administrative record.

Appendix C-1

Archaeological Resources Evaluation Criteria

Instructions for preparing a proposal:

All proposals must comply with instructions in the General Statement of Agency Needs. If selected, the proponents must obtain permits when required by Federal, State and/or local regulation/policy and should factor this in to the proposal. Additionally, the proponents must meet the Secretary of the Interior's qualifications for cultural resource personnel, maintain security of cultural resource information, and prepare cultural resource data in formats compatible with the Nevada Cultural Resource Information System (NVCRIS).

Lincoln County Land Act of 2000 funds shall only be used for the inventory, evaluation, protection and management of "archaeological resources" as defined in the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979.

Proposals received by the specified due date will be scored and subsequently ranked based on the following criteria.

Criterion I: Meets the archaeological resource goals of the Lincoln County Archaeological Initiative.

20 points

The proposal demonstrates that it will meet archaeological resource goals of the Lincoln County Archaeological Initiative. The goals are:

- 1) Preserve, protect, monitor, restore, maintain, and/or enhance archaeological resources in place for the public, conservation, scientific, or traditional uses which will result in improved resource management practices;
- 2) Conserve through inventory, evaluation, protection monitoring, and restoration archaeological collections and records;
- 3) Utilize, share, and interpret the results of archaeological research with academia, management, tribes and the public;
- 4) Increase public outreach and participation in archaeology;
- 5) Complements and supports existing plans of the agency to which the proposal applies such as land use and resource management plans.

Criterion II: Response to the priority (ies) stated in the General Statement of Agency Needs.

60 points

The proposal provides a strong response to the priority (ies) stated in the General Statement of Agency Needs. The proposal outlines a research and/or work plan for the archaeological resource(s) that have been targeted under one of the priorities. The proposal identifies 1) purpose and archaeological context of the project, 2) methodology, 3) reporting and other products describing results, 4) work schedule or timeline, and 5) detailed description of deliverables and associated costs.

Criterion III: Capability**10 points**

The proposal demonstrates specialized experience, equipment and facilities to carry out the proposal. The proposal identifies specialized experience, expert or specialized personnel, specialized services, equipment, and facilities to conduct the elements of the research and/or work plan. ~~Federal agencies and local governments will be rated neutral (5 points).~~

Criterion IV: Past Performance**10 points**

The proposal demonstrates a past record of performance on similar work performed for federal, state, local, or private entities with respect to cost, type of work, quality of work and ability to meet schedule by providing three references of recent and relevant work performed within the past three years. References must include: Project title, agency/organization for which the work was performed, Award Number, dollar amount, brief description of the work, name, and phone of contact. Offerors without recent or relevant references shall submit a statement to such effect in order to be considered as having a 'neutral' Past Performance (5 points).

Evaluation Total: 100 points**Price**

Selection is determined by considering the Total Points of each proposal, and Cost (not just Cost). To be considered, proponents must prepare Attachment 1-Expanded 3 Year Budget and Appendix B-1, Archaeological Resources Estimated Necessary Expenses & Key Milestone Dates.