

**Justin S. Greene**  
Commissioner, District 1

**Lisa Cacari Stone**  
Commissioner, District 2

**Camilla Bustamante**  
Commissioner, District 3



**Adam Fulton Johnson**  
Commissioner, District 4

**Hank Hughes**  
Commissioner, District 5

**Gregory S. Shaffer**  
County Manager

May 29, 2026

**SANTA FE COUNTY**  
**RFP No. 2026-0064-PW/DK**  
**Water Reclamation Facility Expansion - Design-Build Project**  
**ADDENDUM NO. 3**

Dear Proponents,

This addendum is issued to reflect the following immediately. It shall be the responsibility of interested Offerors to adhere to any changes or revisions to the RFP as identified in this Addendum No. 3. This documentation shall become permanent and made part of the departmental files.

---

***RFP DOCUMENT REVISIONS:***

- ❖ *Section V.C.1, Phase II Proposal Format, is revised to move the Schedule from Volume II to Volume I. Volume I shall include the Technical Proposal, including the Schedule. Volume II shall include the Cost Proposal only.*

*Section V.C.2, Phase II Evaluation Factors, is revised to state that the Schedule will be evaluated under Factor No. 2, Quality of Construction Approach. Factor No. 5 will evaluate Cost only. All point allocations remain unchanged.*

- ❖ *Phase II Proposal Submission*

*The Phase II Proposal submission deadline has been extended. Phase II Proposals must be received no later than **July 14, 2026, at 2:00 p.m. Mountain Time.***

*Dropbox Submission Link: <https://www.dropbox.com/request/bw35x4eyu8sgtm8hm3a5>*

***Attachment D: Alternative Technical Concept Meeting Procedures and Schedule***

---

Question No. 1: MACC Responsiveness/Funding

Section II.B, Scope of Work, states that the project has a Maximum Allowable Construction Cost (MACC) of \$13,000,000. Based on a preliminary review of the scope of work it appears that the required scope of work is going to exceed the MACC. Will an Offeror be deemed non-responsive if the proposed cost exceeds the MACC, or will a proposal above the MACC still be Evaluated?

**Answer No. 1: No. An Offeror will not be deemed nonresponsive solely because its proposed cost exceeds the MACC.**

Question No. 2: MACC Exceeded Limit

If the total price exceeds available funding, does County intend to; revise scope, seek additional funding, negotiate, or terminate procurement?

**Answer No. 2: The County intends to negotiate with the highest ranked Offeror to determine whether the project can be completed within available funding.**

Question No. 3: Project Priority / Basis of Design:

The RFP establishes a Maximum Allowable Construction Cost (MACC) of \$13,000,000, while also requiring expansion of the facility to 1.0 MGD with future modular expandability, advanced nutrient removal, reuse quality effluent, and continued operation of the existing plant during construction.

Please clarify the County's primary project objective in the event these objectives conflict:

Priority A: Deliver a complete 1.0 MGD facility, even if the total price exceeds MACC; or

Priority B: Deliver a project that remains within MACC, even if scope, capacity, or certain facility improvements must be reduced.

**Answer No. 3: Priority A. The County's primary objective is to deliver a complete 1.0 MGD facility that meets the requirements of the RFP.**

Question No. 4: Cost Evaluation

Section 5, Cost and Schedule, of the Phase II Evaluation Factors states that compliance with the MACC is a component of the cost evaluation; however, this section does not state how the County will be evaluating the proposed cost in relation to the MACC. Can clarification be provided on how the County intends to utilize compliance with the MACC as an evaluation metric for the submitted proposals?

**Answer No. 4: The Cost factor is worth 300 points and will be evaluated using the cost formula stated in the RFP:**

**Cost Score = (Lowest Responsive Price ÷ Offeror Price) × 300**

**Compliance with the MACC will be considered as part of the County's review of cost reasonableness and consistency with the technical proposal. MACC compliance is not a separate point allocation.**

#### Question No. 5: Schedule Evaluation

Section 5, Cost and Schedule, of the Phase II Evaluation Factors includes the Offerors schedule as part of this section; however, the section does not state how the County will utilize the schedule as an evaluation factor or what aspects of the schedule will be considered a priority. Can clarification be provided on how the County intends to evaluate the Offerors proposed schedule as part of the overall proposal evaluation process?

**Answer No. 5: As revised by this Addendum, the Schedule has been moved from Evaluation Factor No. 5 to Evaluation Factor No. 2, Quality of Construction Approach. Factor No. 5 will evaluate cost only.**

**The proposed schedule will be evaluated as part of the Offeror's technical response. The County will consider whether the schedule is realistic, achievable, properly sequenced, and demonstrates the ability to complete the project on time and within budget while maintaining continuous operation of the facility during construction. The most complete, realistic, and well supported schedule may receive a higher score under Evaluation Factor No. 2.**

#### Question No. 6: Target Substantial Completion/Contract Duration

Section V, Evaluation Factors paragraph A, states that a target substantial completion date will be established in Phase II; however, Addendum 2 which initiated phase II or the provided Phase 2 schedule appears not to state a target substantial completion date or a maximum allowed contract duration. Does the County have a target substantial completion date or maximum contract duration for the project?

**Answer No. 6: The County's goal is to achieve substantial completion as soon as practicable. Offerors shall provide their proposed substantial completion date and contract duration as part of their Technical Proposal. The final substantial completion date and contract duration will be subject to negotiation with the selected Offeror.**

#### Question No. 7: Contract Duration/Target Substantial Completion

Will the contactor's proposed project duration or proposed substantial completion date provided in their proposed project schedule be the basis for the contract duration, or will the County's Target Substantial Completion Date remain as the basis for contract completion?

**Answer No. 7: The contract duration and substantial completion date will be subject to negotiation with the selected Offeror. The Offeror's proposed project duration and schedule will be considered during negotiations.**

#### Question No. 8: Question Response Timeline

The Provided Phase 2 Schedule states that responses to the written questions will be provided on June 5th. Due to the tight time frame of Phase 2 and the need for the proposing teams to receive questions as soon as possible, can the County provide answers to submitted questions as close to the question submission dates as possible in lieu of releasing all responses on the indicated date of June 5th? Also, Can the County Respond to this RFI by the field meeting on May 14th?

**Answer No. 8: As requested, verbal clarifications were provided at the Mandatory Phase II Site Visit and Pre Proposal Conference to assist the shortlisted Offerors. Formal responses are being issued through this Addendum prior to June 5, 2026, to provide Offerors with additional time.**

Question No. 9: Alternative Technical Concept (ATC) Meetings

Will confidential Alternative Technical Concept (ATC) meetings be offered during Phase II?

If yes, please delineate:

- frequency
- format No format.
- confidentiality protections
- decision turnaround time

ATC review greatly improves innovation, lowers lifecycle cost, and reduces proposal risk.

**Answer No. 9: Yes. The County intends to offer one confidential ATC meeting with each shortlisted Offeror, if requested. There is no required format. The Offeror shall present its ATC during the meeting. ATC presented by one Offeror will not be disclosed to other Offerors. Feedback will be provided during the ATC meeting.**

Question No. 10: Stipend

Evaluation Factor Section C.3 states that an unsuccessful Phase 2 Offeror that submits a responsive Phase 2 proposal may be eligible to receive a \$40,000 dollar stipend, and that it is at the County's sole discretion if the Stipend will be authorized and provided. Please confirm that the county will be providing an unsuccessful Phase 2 Offeror that submits a response proposal with the indicated stipend of \$40,000?

A simple Yes/No is requested.

**Answer No. 10: Yes, if the design solution being proposed is creditable and responsive.**

Question No. 11: Stipend

If a stipend is offered to a Phase 2 Offeror and the Offeror elects to receive the stipend, will the County then retain the rights to the Offerors proposal and any intellectual property contained within?

**Answer No. 11: Yes. If an Offeror elects to receive the stipend, the County will retain the rights to the Offeror's proposal and any intellectual property contained therein. The stipend is intended to help offset the costs incurred by an Offeror in preparing a design solution and cost proposal, and to encourage participation in Phase II. The County further understands that the design solution may only be utilized for this specific site location.**

Question No. 12: Volume 2, Cost Section Requirements

The RFP or Addendum 2 did not provide a cost schedule/bid form or include instructions on what is required to be included for the cost portion in Section 5 of the Phase 2 proposal? Will the County be providing a cost schedule/bid form and are there any other documents or information that will be required to be included within the cost portion of Section 5.

**Answer No. 12: The County will provide a Cost Proposal Form for Volume II. Offerors shall submit their total proposed cost based on their proposed design and construction solution. A traditional bid sheet with unit price items will not be provided.**

**Volume II shall include the completed Cost Proposal Form and a general schedule of values equal to the total cost proposal.**

Question No. 13: Bid Bond

Is a bid bond required to be included with the Offeror's Phase 2 submission?

**Answer No. 13: No. A bid bond is not required with the Phase II submission. The selected Offeror shall furnish Performance and Payment Bonds in accordance with the RFP and final Design Build Agreement prior to issuance of the Notice to Proceed.**

Question No. 14: Alternative Technical Concept (ATC) Meeting: As our entire design and construction approach is highly dependent on responses to very technical questions. Can a confidential ATC meeting be held at your earliest convenience? The confidential discussion will allow our Design Build Team to pursue competitive savings, if they are beneficial to Santa Fe County.

**Answer No. 14: Yes, see Attachment D: Alternative Technical Concept Meeting Procedures and Schedule.**

Question No. 15: Proposal Format: Can it be confirmed that the Phase II proposals will need to follow the same formatting requirements for Phase 1 as stipulated in RFP Section IV. C "Proposal Format", and if not, can the formatting requirements be provided for the Phase II proposal?

**Answer No. 15: Phase II Proposals shall follow the general formatting requirements stated in Section IV.C of the RFP. The Phase I 20 page limit does not apply to Phase II.**

**Volume I shall include the Technical Proposal, including the proposed design concept, technical response, construction approach, Schedule, and other applicable technical evaluation factors. No pricing shall be included in Volume I. Volume I shall not exceed 30 pages, excluding appendices.**

**Volume II shall include the Cost Proposal only, including the completed Cost Proposal Form and any required supporting cost information. Volume II is not subject to the 30 page limit.**

Question No. 16: Page Size: Can it be confirmed that 11x17 pages will be allowed for drawings, charts, schedules, images or other aspects of the proposal where the larger 11x17 format helps with readability and clarity?

**Answer No. 16: Yes. 11x17 pages are allowed for drawings, charts, schedules, images, and similar exhibits where needed for readability.**

Question No. 17: Appendix Inclusion: Can the offerors' Phase II proposals provide Drawings, Schedules, Design Calculations, and other information as Appendixes in lieu of containing these features in the proposal narrative body?

**Answer No. 17: Yes. Drawings, schedules, design calculations, and other supporting information may be provided as appendices. The technical narrative must still address the applicable Phase II evaluation factors.**

Question No. 18: Internal Proposal Hyperlinks: Are offerors permitted to include internal hyperlinks within the PDF proposal that direct reviewers to appendices and other relevant sections to facilitate navigation, readability, and the overall evaluation process?

102 Grant Avenue · P.O. Box 276 · Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-0276 · 505-986-6200 · FAX:  
505-995-2740 [www.santafecountynm.gov](http://www.santafecountynm.gov)

**Answer No. 18: Yes. Internal hyperlinks within the PDF proposal are allowed. Specific responses to the criteria factors within the Technical Volume that refer the committee to a Hyperlink will not be accepted.**

Question No. 19: Proposal Submission Extension Request: Numerous highly technical questions with substantial impact on both the technical approach and overall project strategy have been submitted; however, as of Friday, May 22nd, responses have not yet been provided. The information requested is critical to advancing preliminary design efforts, refining project assumptions, assessing risk, and developing a complete, accurate, and competitive proposal. Without sufficient time to fully evaluate and incorporate the forthcoming clarifications, additional information, and other material guidance into the County needs and proposal requirements, offerors may be forced to proceed based on assumptions that could ultimately affect proposal quality, pricing accuracy/competitiveness, and overall project alignment. Accordingly, we respectfully request a three-week extension to the proposal submission deadline to allow adequate time for thoughtful review and incorporation of the pending responses. We believe this extension is in the best interest of the County and all project stakeholders, as it will promote more comprehensive, well-developed, and competitive proposals from all submitting offerors.

**Answer No. 19: The Phase II proposal due date is extended to 2:00pm (MST) July 14, 2026.**

Question No. 20: Extension Request for Questions: There is a strong likelihood that additional questions will arise following receipt of the pending responses to the currently outstanding questions. In addition, further clarification requests may need to be formally submitted after the one-on-one meetings, which have not yet been scheduled or coordinated. Given the need to have time to ask follow up questions to the pending responses and the pending One-on-One meetings, can the deadline for questions be extended by three weeks? We feel this extension is in the best interest of all project stakeholders and will provide the County with higher quality, more complete, and more competitive proposals from all submitting offerors.

**Answer No. 20: Offerors may submit questions for clarification within 48 hours after issuance of the Addendum.**

Question No. 21: Given the current procurement schedule, the period between the Phase II written question responses (June 5, 2026) and the current Phase II Proposal submission date (June 23, 2026) provides limited time for proposal design development, subcontractor and vendor outreach, detailed estimating, and overall proposal finalization.

As this project involves a design-build wastewater treatment facility expansion, significant coordination is required among the design team, equipment vendors, and specialty subcontractors. Additional time would support a more complete and coordinated proposal effort.

An extension would benefit the County by:

- Allowing increased participation from subcontractors and equipment vendors, resulting in more competitive and comprehensive pricing
- Providing additional time for development of proposal-level design and concept documents to better define scope and reduce assumptions
- Reducing pricing uncertainty, contingency carry, and qualification language associated with compressed procurement durations
- Improving overall proposal quality and alignment with Owner expectations

102 Grant Avenue · P.O. Box 276 · Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-0276 · 505-986-6200 · FAX:  
505-995-2740 [www.santafecountynm.gov](http://www.santafecountynm.gov)

We believe the additional time would ultimately support the submission of more accurate, complete, and competitive proposals for the Project.

To allow adequate time to fully develop a Phase II Proposal that satisfies the requirements of Volume I – Technical Proposal and Volume II – Cost Proposal and Schedule, we respectfully request consideration of extending the current proposal due date from June 23, 2026 to July 10, 2026.

**Answer No. 21: Phase II Proposal submittal due date has been extended to July 14, 2026.**

Question No. 22: In section IV, paragraph C of RFP\_2026-0064-PW/DK, the RFP has very specific guidelines for Phase I of the proposal.

a. Is there specific proposal submission formatting required for Phase II submission, including page limit, format, tabs, margins, font size, etc.?

**Answer No. 22: Yes. Phase II Proposals shall follow the general formatting requirements in Section IV.C of the RFP. Volume I shall include the Technical Proposal and shall not exceed 30 pages, excluding appendices. Volume II shall include the Cost Proposal only and does not have a page limit.**

Question No. 23: At the mandatory site visit, it was mentioned that the schedule component would be pulled out of Volume II of the proposal from the cost and put into the technical portion.

a. Is there a specific location this schedule component is required within the document?

b. How is the schedule weighted into the scoring criteria?

c. Does the County want a full P6 Schedule or is a collapsed version acceptable? If a full P6 is necessary, can we submit that in an appendix?

**Answer No. 23: See the Revision section at the beginning of this Addendum. The Schedule has been moved from Volume II to Volume I and will be evaluated under Factor No. 2, Quality of Construction Approach.**

**a. The Schedule shall be included in Volume I as part of the Offeror's response to Factor No. 2, Quality of Construction Approach.**

**b. The Schedule will be evaluated as part of Factor No. 2. There is no separate point allocation for Schedule, and all point allocations remain unchanged.**

**c. A collapsed schedule is acceptable. A full P6 schedule is not required, but may be included in an appendix if submitted.**

Question No. 24: To allow adequate time to fully develop a Phase II Proposal that satisfies the requirements of Volume I – Technical Proposal and Volume II – Cost Proposal and Schedule.

a. We would like the County to take into consideration an extension of the current proposal due date from June 23, 2026 to July 10, 2026.

b. If the county extends the deadline to July 10, 2026, can we have a second round of RFI questions with a deadline of June 22, 2026, and responses to be provided by July 1, 2026.

Answer No. 24: Phase II Proposal due date is extended to July 14, 2026.

The County will not provide a second round of RFI questions. However, Offerors may request clarification to the answers provided within 48 hours after receipt of Addendum.

Question No. 25: Section IV.C, Proposal Format, specifies that proposals shall be typewritten on standard 8½ x 11 paper with a font no smaller than 12-point pitch, nominal 1-inch margins, and normal line spacing. Do these formatting requirements apply universally to all proposal pages, including plans, schedules, and image-heavy exhibits, or may those specific materials be presented in a format that optimizes legibility for the evaluation committee, such as the use of 11x17-sized pages for those containing more detailed exhibits?

Answer No. 25: The general formatting requirements apply to the proposal narrative. However, drawings, schedules, charts, images, and similar exhibits may be provided in 11x17 format where needed for readability and may be included in the appendices.

Question No. 26: Can you please confirm whether the \$20,000,000 Umbrella/Excess Liability limit is intended to sit over the Commercial General Liability policy to achieve the \$20,000,000 aggregate requirement, or whether each coverage layer must independently meet its stated minimum limits? For example would \$20,000,000 worth of limits satisfy the insurance requirements or is the contract requiring \$40,000,000 limits.

Answer No. 26: The Umbrella/Excess Liability coverage may sit over the Commercial General Liability policy to satisfy the required liability limits. The County is not requiring separate coverage layers totaling \$40,000,000. The required total aggregate liability coverage is \$20,000,000.

Shortlisted Offerors shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 3 with their Phase II Proposal submission. This Addendum shall become part of the RFP documents and any resulting contract documents. All terms and conditions of the RFP, including any prior and future addenda, not modified by this Addendum shall remain in full force and effect. Responders are reminded that any questions or need for clarification must be addressed to Dani Koussa, Procurement Specialist Senior at [dkoussa@santafecountynm.gov](mailto:dkoussa@santafecountynm.gov).