

**MINUTES OF THE**

**SANTA FE COUNTY**

**LA BAJADA RANCH STEERING COMMITTEE**

**June 26, 2014**

This meeting of the Santa Fe County La Bajada Ranch Steering Committee was called to order by Vice Chair Peter Weiss at approximately 4:07 on the above-cited date in the La Cienega Community Center, 136 Camino San Jose, Santa Fe New Mexico.

A quorum was achieved with the following members present:

**Members Present:**

Peter Weiss, Vice Chair  
Commissioner Kathy Holian  
Maria DeAnda-Hay  
Jay Lazarus  
John Nye  
Paul White

**Member(s) Absent:**

Eric Blinman, Chair  
Camilla Bustamante  
Commissioner Robert Anaya  
Claire Fulenwider



**Staff Present:**

Mark Hogan, Projects & Facilities Director  
Tony Flores, County Manager's Office  
Bill Taylor, Procurement Director

**Others Present:**

Dianne Strauss

COUNTY OF SANTA FE )  
STATE OF NEW MEXICO ) ss  
LA BAJADA RANCH STEERING COMMITTEE  
PAGES: 7  
I Hereby Certify That This Instrument Was Filed for  
Record On The 6TH Day Of November, 2014 at 08:47:41 AM  
And Was Duly Recorded as Instrument # 1750200  
Of The Records Of Santa Fe County

Witness My Hand And Seal Of Office  
Geraldine Salazar  
Deputy County Clerk, Santa Fe, New Mexico  
*Marcella Salazar*

**III. Approval of Agenda**

Upon motion by Mr. Lazarus and second by Commissioner Holian, the agenda was unanimously approved.

**IV. Approval of Minutes: April 24, 2014**

Commissioner Holian moved to defer action on the minutes until the next meeting. Ms. DeAnda-Hay seconded and the motion to table the minutes passed unanimously.

**V. Subcommittee Reports**

Mr. Weiss noted that the subcommittees had not met, however, he composed a report to the BCC with the proposed timeline. [Exhibit 1] There were some legal concerns and it is

currently being reviewed by the Legal Department.

## **VI. Old Business**

None was presented.

## **VII. New Business**

### **A. Santa Fe County Legal review regarding form and content of solicitations**

Mr. Hogan said the question was not legal per se but rather procurement regulations vis-à-vis: "What are we asking for?" If concepts were being solicited then there would be no need to go through the procurement process. However, if something more concrete is desired the process is more rigorous and raises the question: What is the committee's responsibility and what are the expectations? He read through the resolution regarding the duties of the committee.

Mr. Weiss said he was envisioning a two-step process.

Tony Flores of the Manager's Office stated he was troubled by the word "proposals" in the resolution, which implies an RFP is involved. It would be the committee's role to rank responses to the solicitation and to prepare a report for the Commission.

Bill Taylor, Procurement Director, indicated the RFP could entail two steps. The interested parties would be qualified through criteria. They would be ranked and short-listed, thereupon the committee would hear details and costs from the qualified parties.

Mr. Lazarus said it sounded like an RFQ followed by an RFP.

Mr. Taylor said the qualifications would be based on things like experience and understanding the scope of work. Those making the short list would come up with design solutions, implementation plan and cost.

Mr. White asked if there would be an appeal process for firms not meeting the criteria. Mr. Taylor said everything is open and they can ask why they weren't short-listed at the tail end of the process. There has to be solid grounds for eliminating a firm.

Mr. Weiss said the idea is to give everyone an opportunity to look at the property before submitting an RFP.

Mr. Flores said soliciting ideas first and then presenting those ideas to the Board can't happen. He said the committee can set up the RFP process however they want, for instance, with pre-proposal conferences at the site. Mr. Taylor said the RFP will have a schedule of events with site visits, deadlines for questions, etc.

Mr. Flores said he still has concerns with the process, but the County Manager asked that it go through a typical RFP process. He said Mr. Taylor's office will put out the RFP, receive responses, which he will turn over to the evaluation committee. Mr. Taylor will act as facilitator for the discussions.

Mr. Lazarus said in his experience in responding to RFPs there is no price attached. One makes a proposal after qualifying. Mr. Flores said that is the process for professional services, i.e., for architects, engineers, landscape architects, construction managers, etc., where price is not a factor. Other RFPs do have costs attached in the evaluation.

Mr. Taylor said technically this is referred to as a competitive sealed proposal involving the two steps. Following qualification, the respondents will submit design solution with financing proposals included. The County will separate those. Once the highest ranked proposer is determined negotiations can take place.

Mr. Lazarus pointed out that one firm could propose a park and another high-intensity development. It will be comparing apples and oranges. Mr. Taylor said the committee will need to define and structure highest and best use. Mr. Weiss said they have developed an evaluation process but he wasn't sure they would be able to judge qualifications. Mr. Taylor said proposing firms can team up.

Ms. DeAnda-Hay noted that the resolution gives some guidance on 12 to 15 things the Board wants. She asked if the committee needed to rank those things. Mr. Taylor said the applicants will need to know the scoring criteria. Mr. Flores said the ranking criteria should be formulated and weighted upfront.

Mr. Lazarus asked if the Commissioners on the committee could vote in the evaluations. Mr. Hogan said it could turn out that they would not participate in evaluations.

Mr. Taylor said a first step would be developing qualification criteria. Mr. Flores added they should establish how many applicants should be on the short list. Mr. Lazarus suggested there could be a number of short lists – for conservation, sales, development, etc.

Mr. Weiss asked County staff to review the criteria the committee has arrived at. Mr. Hogan explained how projects are typically done, outlining a scope of work and coordinating with the Purchasing Department. Mr. Weiss said the criteria may have to be tweaked with the help of Purchasing.

Mr. Lazarus said now that the process is becoming less abstract submitters will require some time to do due diligence. Mr. Taylor said there is some thought that getting good proposals necessitates stipends and the Procurement Code allows for this. Mr. Flores stated they would bring packets and schedules to the next meeting. Mr. Nye asked that it be provided before the next meeting to allow committee members time to review.

Mr. Weiss indicated it would be necessary to align the committee's criteria with that of the Purchasing Department, and Mr. Taylor said they are totally different, and the schedule will have to be revised.

Mr. Taylor described an RFI process roundtable discussion format where ideas are thrown out and blended. Mr. White asked if it was still being called an RFP. Mr. Weiss said they are now jumping over the RFI and going straight to the RFP. He said additional public input is

needed. Mr. Flores said the discussion would not be about changing the process.

Regarding the solicitation process, Mr. Nye said they have been very creative to this point in opening up a wide horizon for different types of proposals. He speculated that the County's process would elicit some of the very creative areas. Mr. Flores said "highest and best use" is a very broad criterion. Mr. Nye said they should review the solicitation process with an eye to reaching the maximum number of participants. Mr. Hogan said they have a list of people who have inquired on the website. Mr. Flores said they can post notices on the County website. Mr. Nye suggested reaching out to different industries. Mr. Flores said the committee could point out directions but County staff would have to do it.

Mr. Hogan spoke of earlier discussions on having multiple developers for different aspects versus having one master developer. It might be necessary to advise applicants of the advisability of teaming up. He said someone proposing a use for only part of the property would be deemed unresponsive.

Speaking of the 15 criteria, Mr. Lazarus suggested giving each one a possible hundred points. Mr. Hogan said he believe the committee would provide direction in ranking. Mr. Lazarus alluded to the vast number of permutations and combinations of uses and financing.

Mr. Taylor reiterated the process of short-listing qualified applicants, followed by solutions and plans.

Mr. Weiss asked the committee to come up with possible candidates who might be interested in submitting. Ms. DeAnda-Hay asked if solicitations were typically made on a local or national level. Mr. Taylor said they are required to advertise in at least one local or well distributed newspaper but nothing precludes seeking applicants nationally. The goal is to foster competition. Mr. Nye asked if there was a budget for advertising the solicitation, i.e., could there be advertisements in major national publications. Mr. Hogan said there is some budget allocation. Ms. DeAnda-Hay indicated the committee could bring back suggestions.

Mr. Taylor said there is a minimum 10-day advertising period but for best results he recommended 45 days with site visits. Mr. Lazarus speculated that with all the complications it could take a year and Mr. Flores said they do not have a year; the BCC is waiting for results. Mr. Nye pointed out that in terms of real estate value the window is expanding.

Mr. Flores stated it was impossible to predict how many bids would come in, and after the solicitation is closed there will be defined deadlines. Mr. Taylor said they can discuss the schedule at the next meeting.

Mr. Flores said he met with La Cienega residents and learned that the property to the south has been consolidated into three lots, which will require an amendment to the previous master plan. The access has not changed.

## **VII. B. Review and Approve Final Draft**

This item was deferred.

**VIII. Comments from the Public**

Diane Strauss showed a future land use map and the latest March draft map of the proposed zoning. She noted that on the future land use map the 1,300-acre enclave was shown as ag-ranch, traditional, while on the zoning map it is shown as planned development district. She asked who authorized that change. Commissioner Holian said it was adopted by the BCC since there is an existing master plan. Mr. Flores added the master plan has entitlements that cannot be eliminated without a formal process.

**IX. Comments from Committee Members**

Mr. Hogan suggested holding off on incorporating new members at this stage of the process, with the possible exception of Ed Moreno. Mr. Flores said outreach was made to Tesuque Pueblo. Mr. Hogan said they declined the original offer.

**X. Agenda Items:**

- 4/24/14 minutes
- List of potential solicitees
- Presentation by Procurement
- Discussion of ranking process
- 

- A. Time: 4:00
- B. Date: July 24, 2014
- C. Location: Legal Conference Room

**XI. Adjournment**

Having completed the items on the agenda, this meeting was declared adjourned at 5:15.

Approved by:

La Bajada Ranch Steering Committee



GERALDINE SALAZAR  
COUNTY CLERK

*Geraldine Salazar*  
10-28-2014

Respectfully submitted

Debbie Doyle, Wordswork

## La Bajada Ranch Steering Committee

Report to the Board of County Commissioners, May 1, 2014

The Steering Committee for La Bajada Ranch has been meeting regularly since October 2013 as per County Resolution 2012/107. We have organized ourselves into a working group that has come to understand each other and the complex issues facing any development of the La Bajada Ranch property. We have reached out to the public to encourage their participation in our deliberations, including holding a public access day at the Ranch, which was made even more effective by the participation of the La Cienega Community. The Committee has done it's best to reach out to and build bridges with the community in La Cienega, something we view as essential to any successful future development. We have also, through sub-committees, worked to create the mandated criteria and processes by which such development can happen.

Members of the Steering Committee now wish to submit this report for recommendation which outlines a number of steps for the evaluation and selection of alternative proposals for the future use of the La Bajada Ranch property purchased by the County in 2009.

This report specifically outlines  
criteria to be used in the soliciting and evaluation of proposals from the public and interested parties for the future use of the property  
a detailed outline of the recommendation process to be used  
a timeline for soliciting, receiving, and evaluating such proposals, along with recommended procedures for this process  
a request for clarification about the range and scope of responsibility the BCC intends for the Committee as this process moves ahead

### Evaluation

The Committee respectfully submits a copy of the Sub-Committee Report on Evaluation Criteria. This document spells out the requirements we recommend for any proposals submitted for projects at the Ranch. While specific in its requirements, please bear in mind that proposals will come in two stages: first, the Committee solicits "Proposals for Ideas" (RFIs). Then after a preliminary evaluation by the Committee members intended to winnow ideas to a manageable number, the Committee will forward our recommendations to the BCC for consideration. With the approval of the BCC, submitters will then be invited to submit a formal proposal (RFP) which will have to also meet the more stringent criteria of other County agencies (for ex. Purchasing, Legal, etc)

Please see the attached Evaluation Criteria Report for details.

### Recommendation Process

Following this Interim Report and its approval by the BCC, the Committee will proceed with advertising the process by which RFIs may be presented to the County.

During this period the Ranch will be made accessible to the public on no less than three occasions and Committee members and members of County Staff will be on hand to provide detailed information. There will also be held at least two Public Inquiry Meetings to address questions from the public. Information will also be posted on the County website and the Committee recommends the construction of a dedicated social media webpage (such as a Facebook page) in order to stimulate and publicize informed public debate.

Once proposals have been received and the deadline for submitting has passed the Committee shall undertake the evaluation of ideas following the criteria listed above. A Recommendation Report will then be sent to the BCC for action.

### Timeline

The timeline for these steps is as follows:

- I
- |                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| May 13, 2014:     | BCC meeting approval   |
| May13-31:         | Construction of webpage, advertising, information packets, etc for public.   |
| June 1- August 1: | 60 day Solicitation period during which two Public Inquiry Meetings will be held, one on June 15 and another before July 15 (as requested). In addition, during June the ranch will be open to the public on at least three occasions for public inspection. These dates will be determined by Staff availability and weather. |
| August 1          | RFIs due to be received by County. Committee evaluation process begins. Evaluations will be confidential. Our regular open meeting will be able to report on progress and process.   |
| September 25      | Scheduled monthly meeting to approve report to BCC   |
| October 1         | Recommendations sent to BCC for consideration.   |

### Clarification

The Committee requests that the BCC clarify any continuing role for the Committee after the October 1 report. At this stage recommended proposers will be invited to submit formal RFPs to the County. Should the BCC want the Committee to continue with this next stage of evaluation and work on the ranch development, we request a recommendation from the BCC to this effect.

### Summary

We request authorization from the BCC to proceed as outlined in the above report.

Respectfully submitted

Peter Weiss, Vice-Chairman, Steering Committee