June 5, 2026

SANTA FE COUNTY
RFP No. 2026-0064-PW/DK
Water Reclamation Facility Expansion - Design-Build Project
ADDENDUM NO. 4

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. 4. This documentation shall become permanent and made part of the departmental files.

Attachment E: Cost Proposal Form
Attachment F: Agreement No. 2012-0229-PW

Dropbox Link:
https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/0zxg80g8iozu4rwqnr5u0/AFbyIqJgGWABZYmXNKodstU?rlkey=p993gtze5tudy697hw37s2m5b&st=0vzpx4t9&dl=0

Question No. 1: Effluent Quality: The existing WRF apparently was not designed to meet the same effluent quality criteria established for the expanded WRF in the RFP, particularly with respect to phosphorus removal. The planned improvements (shown as FUTURE on the Record Drawings) to the existing aeration basin, with the addition of the basins at the end of the structure and adding the internal recycle stream, will improve the nitrogen treatment capacity but will not provide biological phosphorus removal.
QUESTION: To what extent, if any, will improvements to the existing WRF be required in this expansion to bring the existing WRF Aeration Basin into compliance with the effluent quality criteria established for the new WRF? If none, please acknowledge that the blended effluent from the existing and new facilities will not meet the more stringent effluent quality criteria established in the RFP.

Answer No. 1: This proposal is not to include improvements to the existing phase one.

Question No. 2: Project Limits: What are the limits of the County's land parcel that is available for use for the Water Reclamation Facility Expansion?

Answer No. 2: See Attachment F - Agreement No. 2012-0229-PW

Question No. 3: Allowed Shutdowns: Are any short-term temporary plant shutdowns allowed for tie-ins or other related work tasks?

Answer No. 3: Coordinated shutdowns can be facilitated with proper notice.

Question No. 4: The current discharge permit, DP-234, has a total nitrogen limit of 10 mg/L. The RFP states an effluent quality less than 3.0 mg/L for total nitrogen.
a. Please advise on what effluent quality should be used for design criteria.

Answer No. 4: The treatment requirements should meet or exceed the required removal of nitrogen, and the design criteria should use the DP as the baseline reference for what is needed from the treatment process

Question No. 5: We understand that there currently is SCADA at the site.
a. Can we be provided with a 12-month history of flow data?

Answer No. 5: Yes. The requested 12-month history of flow data will be provided through the Dropbox link at the beginning of this Addendum. Each shortlisted Design-Build Team will be notified once the documents have been uploaded.

Question No. 6: Can the influent load criteria, including biological oxygen demand, total suspended solids, total Kjeldahl nitrogen, total phosphorous, minimum water temperature and alkalinity at a minimum be provided?

Answer No. 6: Answer No. 6: The County will provide available influent data, including TKN, TSS, BOD, temperature, and pH, through the Dropbox link at the beginning of this Addendum. The County's discharge permit does not currently require sampling for phosphorus. Each shortlisted Design-Build Team will be notified once the documents have been uploaded.

Question No. 7: It was noted in Section II, paragraph B. Scope of Work, of RFP_2026-0064-PW/DK for specialty elements and considerations for the project shall include but are not limited to the following: A full time Operator 4 for six months to train staff and operate the new facility.
a. Does this role need to be included in the cost proposal?

Answer No. 7: No. The County currently has a Level 4 Operator onsite; therefore, the Design-Build Team does not need to include this role in its cost proposal.

Question No. 8: Does the County have a generator submittal or existing sizing calculations from the original installation?

Answer No. 8: No. The County does not have the generator submittal or existing sizing calculations from the original installation.

Question No. 9: Is there a starting sequence for process loads when running on generator power that is controlled by the plant control system?

Answer No. 9: Not at this time.

Question No. 10: Can the County provide shop drawings or photos of MSB?

Answer No. 10: Yes. Available MSB shop drawings or photos will be provided through the Dropbox link at the beginning of this Addendum. Each shortlisted Design-Build Team will be notified once available.

Question No. 11: Can the County provide shop drawings or photos of the PLC?

Answer No. 11: Yes. Available PLC shop drawings or photos will be provided through the Dropbox link at the beginning of this Addendum. Each shortlisted Design-Build Team will be notified once available.

Question No. 12: It was stated during the mandatory site visit that the existing generator is large enough to also service the Phase 2 rollout.
a. Please confirm this is the case.

Answer No. 12: Based on the County's current understanding, the existing generator is assumed to have sufficient capacity to serve Phase 2 expansion.

Question No. 13: In the Phase 2 documents, we were provided with a set of final design documents for the first phase of the project. Additionally, we were provided with a 60% set of specifications.
a. Is a more complete set of final design specifications available for reference?

Answer No. 13: The documents provided with the Phase 2 materials are intended to serve as the reference documents for this procurement. At this time, the County will not be providing additional design specifications.

Question No. 14: Can the County provide preferred location for the sludge drying beds?

Answer No. 14: The preferred location for the sludge drying beds will be coordinated with the awarded Offeror and shall be located onsite.

Question No. 15: Is the aerobic digester intended to function solely as a solids holding tank, providing approximately two to three days of storage capacity?

Answer No. 15: The aerobic digester should not be assumed to function solely as a solids holding tank. The proposed design should support nitrogen removal and include a RAS pump.

Question No. 16: Onsite Stockpile: To reduce the amount of required trucking, will the offerors be allowed to stockpile spoils from earthwork operations onsite?

Answer No. 16: Yes.

Question No. 17: Existing Facility Deficiencies:
The June 2025 Audit Report identifies approximately $7.1 million in existing facility upgrades needed to bring the current plant into acceptable operating condition.
Please clarify:

- are these identified improvements included as part of the Design Build scope, or
- are they considered separate Owner improvements outside this procurement?

If included, please identify which audit recommendations are mandatory scope elements, as some of them may be relied upon by the Design Builder.

Answer No. 17: Existing facility upgrades are not to be included in this proposal.

Question No. 18: Industrial Pretreatment / Influent Quality Control:
Section 6.7 of the June 2025 Audit Report reportedly identifies significant industrial discharge tributary to the SFCWRF.
Please clarify whether Santa Fe County will:

- adopt and enforce an industrial pretreatment ordinance,
- require industrial pretreatment upstream of the SFCWRF, and / or
- guarantee influent characteristics consistent with typical municipal wastewater strength.

Without influent quality certainty, process selection, sizing, and total pricing carry significant risk.

Answer No. 18: The pretreatment will be enforced.

Question No. 19: Confirm Design Criteria for Existing 0.5 MGD WRF:
Please confirm the existing 0.5 MGD WRF was designed based on the following criteria:
Design Flows:

- Average Daily Flow (ADF) = 0.5 MGD
- Peak Hourly Flow (PHF) = 1.0 MGD

Influent Characteristics:

- Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD5) Concentration = 500 mg/L
- Average BOD5 Loading = 2,085 lb/Day
- Total Suspended Solids (TSS) Concentration = 300 mg/L
- Average TSS Loading = 1,251 lb/Day
- Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) Concentration = 50 mg/L
- Average TKN Loading = 208 lb/Day

Please confirm the Effluent Criteria for the existing 0.5 MGD WRF is as follows:

- BOD5 < 20 mg/L
- Total Suspended Solids < 20 mg/L
- Total Nitrogen < 10 mg/L

Answer No. 19: The County is unable to confirm the listed design criteria based on currently available records. Offerors shall rely on the RFP, addenda, provided documents, and their own review in developing their proposed design.

Question No. 20: Confirm Design Influent Criteria:
Please confirm the following design basis for average and peak influent characteristics:

Influent Parameter	Average	Peak
Flow	1.0 MGD	2.0 MGD
BOD	500 mg/L	
TSS	300 mg/L	
TKN	50 mg/L	
NH3	40 mg/L	
TP	8 mg/L	
Alkalinity	200 mg/L	
Temperature	55–80°F	

If it is not acceptable, please provide County-required design influent criteria.

Answer No. 20: For proposal purposes, the listed design influent criteria are acceptable for use as the basis of design.

Question No. 21: Confirm Required Effluent Limits:
The RFP references "NPDES Tier 2" and specifically identifies:

- TN < 3.0 mg/L
- TP < 1.0 mg/L

Referencing NMED GWQB Class 1A requirements for above-ground use of reclaimed domestic wastewater confirm the following required 30-day average effluent limits:

- BOD5 = 10 mg/L
- Turbidity = 3 NTU
- Fecal Coliform = 5 per 100 mL

With confirmation of the above existing and proposed Design Criteria, please provide guidance to the Offerors regarding the extent of retrofits required to bring the existing 0.5 MGD WRF into compliance with the same criteria established for the expansion to 1.0 MGD.
The RFP requires numeric permit targets for process sizing and total pricing.

Answer No. 21: At this time, the County is operating under its discharge permit and not an NPDES Tier 2 permit. For proposal purposes, Offerors shall use Total Nitrogen of 10 mg/L or less. The County will verify the applicable requirements and provide any further clarification by addendum.

Question No. 22: Groundwater Discharge Permit Responsibility
Will the Design-Build Team be responsible for:

- preparing permit applications,
- supporting hydrogeologic studies,
- preparing engineering reports, and / or
- obtaining approval for a new or modified Groundwater Discharge Permit from New Mexico Environment Department?

Please define permitting responsibilities.

Answer No. 22: The groundwater discharge permit will not be the responsibility of design build team.

Question No. 23: NPDES Permit Basis
The RFP references "NPDES Tier 2" requirements yet also states discharge will be by reuse meeting GWQB / Class 1A requirements.
Please identify which receiving water body is designated as a Tier 2 receiving water and where the treated effluent will be discharged, clarify if a federal NPDES permit will be required, and if that is expected to be part of the scope or are referenced nutrient goal performance targets only?

Answer No. 23: See answer 22

Question No. 24: Equipment Standardization
Please clarify whether the County prefers:
- matching existing plant equipment/vendors for operational consistency, or
- open competition for alternate manufacturers at the expense of operational simplicity.

Please identify any Owner-required equipment manufacturers or technologies.

Answer No. 24: Open competition for operational simplicity utilizing existing technology.

Question No. 25: Sludge Handling Basis of Design
Please define County's preferred / required sludge management approach, including:
- aerobic digestion expectations,
- dewatering method,
- drying beds vs. mechanical dewatering,
- hauling / disposal requirements, and
- biosolids classification target.

Answer No. 25: Need both mechanical and drying beds (asphalt or concrete).

Question No. 26: Materials / Durability Standards
Please identify Owner expectations for:
- Materials of construction for metal components (Aluminum, Stainless Steel, Galvanized Steel, Painted Steel),
- protective coatings systems,
- concrete protective lining systems,
- corrosion resistance requirements, and
- minimum design service life.

Material standards significantly affect lifecycle cost and total pricing.

Answer No. 26: Materials and durability standards for Phase II shall be consistent with the existing Phase I plant.

Shortlisted Offerors shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 4 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.