

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

January 20, 2026

SANTA FE COUNTY
Sustainability Department
Utility Feasibility Study
RFP No 2026-0159-CMO
ADDENDUM NO. 2

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

1. Does the RFP have an estimated budget, or current timeline? Are there budget considerations for each year of the contract term?

Answer: While there isn't a specific budget target or identified amount at this point and time, it is expected that the *initial* feasibility portion of the scope is predominantly research based and therefore, costs will be expected to fit within a range depending upon the amount of research to include hourly rates and anticipated hours for each scope required to fulfill subject scope descriptions.

2. Does the County seek a formal feasibility assessment (i.e., legal, technical, political, financial) of full municipalization (as that term is understood in the industry) of the existing utilities' distribution assets and the creation of wholesale power supply and operational capabilities, so as to replace PNM and Jemez Electric Cooperative for all retail electricity delivery to its residents? B. Does the County seek assessments of potential alternatives to full municipalization that can help met the County's energy goals for sustainability, affordability, and resilience?

Answer: The key word is feasibility. What makes the most sense from a cost perspective, from a resiliency perspective? We want to know what it will take to get to municipalization, and the best route to get there from where we stand. What are the steps to get there so we can think about future project phasing?

3. What is the impetus behind this effort?

Answer: Our goals for this project are more specifically outlined in the resolution that was adopted for this project and included in addendum 1: Resolution 2025-124.

4. Does the County have any sense of the ultimate geographic service territory or load service might look like?

Answer: No, we don't have a specific area yet. That is part of what we're analyzing. What might make the most sense, considering the needs of the County and community residents, businesses, as well as service needs?

5. When will we publish the initial response to questions?

Answer: January 16th. This date is located in the sequence of events in the RFP. However, due to the volume of questions received the date has been moved to January 20, 2026.

6. What staff will be involved in the evaluation of the proposals?

Answer: We don't disclose who will be on the committee. But it will be composed of County staff in Sustainability, Growth Management, and/or Public Works. There may be an outside consultant involved who can serve as a subject matter expert.

7. Is the intention that any sustainable energy utility be 100% renewable energy?

Answer: Yes. That is the ultimate goal, but again, what is feasible for us? If 100% renewability is not possible for us, and if there's a way to lower overall dependence of fossil fuels, we would like that included in the response as well.

8. The RFP indicates that the contract will be for 4 years, and that Phase 1 should be completed within 90 days of procurement, followed by a Phase 2. What is the County's vision for the 4 years of the contract? For example, does the County anticipate other phases to be completed after Phase 2, or does the County anticipate that Phase 2 will take multiple years to complete.

Answer: The feasibility portion and recommendations of the study will guide the duration estimate for the following phases.

9. The RFP mentions "community interest and feedback" and "public engagement through workshops." Could the County please elaborate on these components? How many workshops does the County anticipate? Are the workshops open to the public, or focused on stakeholder groups that represent the public's interest?

Answer: At this point and time, there isn't a specific number of engagement events specified, however, best practices point toward a significant effort in reaching underserved populations in the community. Methods on providing such outreach efforts, are both internal and external.

10. The County seeks an analysis of "the benefits that may accrue to the residents of the County with review an impact to respective stakeholders." Which benefits in particular is the County interested in seeing? What does the County mean by "review and impact to respective stakeholders?"

Answer: Costs, resiliency, sustainability, access, equity, public health, environmental health, to name a few.

11. The County seeks an analysis of “the different options and scales available for the County to create a publicly owned sustainable energy utilities or variations thereof.” Does the County have certain options and scales in mind? If so, which ones? Is there a certain number of options the Offeror should expect to include in its budget for this work?

Answer: Please use best practice and case studies, as well as data from comparable areas to include a range of considerations specific to the unique needs of the County to include resiliency, cost, legal viability as well as renewable energy type sourcing. The compilation of information should serve to provide a template for the County to consider and apply in practical as well as beneficial ways for the community.

12. The County seeks an analysis of “previous studies and models both successful and unsuccessful to establish public electrical energy utilities in New Mexico.” Would the County be interested in experiences from states other than New Mexico (so long as the experiences are relevant to New Mexico?)

Answer: Yes. Please see above.

13. For Phase 2, the County requests that load modeling and valuation pathways be included within the feasibility study. Can the County please provide more detail on the type of evaluations it seeks in this regard? For example, are high level estimates sufficient, or is the County looking for building-specific, engineering valuations? Please discuss the level of detail required for a valuation pathway associated with full ownership of electric utility assets by the County. Does the Offeror need to have specific qualifications to value the County’s electrical distribution grid assets? To what extent does the County envision that the current electric utility will be involved in this process? For example, what interactions or data will be required of the electricity utility? How likely is the utility to engage and provide this data?

Answer: High level types of evaluations are acceptable. More granular examples will be considered as well, depending upon the application and need. For instance a micro-grid for a resiliency hub would require more granular detail depending upon the usage, scenario of circumstance being described, etc...

14. How many deliverables would the County like the bidder to account for in its budget? Does the County envision separate reports and presentations to the BCC and the public for each phase of the work?

Answer: Please provide estimates for each phase and hourly rates/quantity of hours for each scope detailed in each phase.

15. The County seeks, “a Phase 1 wherein the consultant conducts a preliminary assessment of legal, technical, community interest and feedback, and financial viability to be completed within 90 days of procurement; a Phase 2 feasibility study assessing load modeling, valuation pathways, legal/regulatory analysis, public engagement through workshops, study groups.” Please describe the legal assessment envisioned in Phase1. What components and level of detail are desired? Please describe the financial viability assessment envisioned in Phase 1. What components and level of detail are desired? Please describe the legal/regulatory analysis envisioned in Phase 1. What components and level of detail are desired? Will the County

expect the consultant to coordinate with outside counsel or to provide licensed legal opinions itself?

Answer: This information will be provided to the awarded vendor and will be dependent upon the real time legal environment and costs considered appropriate for the level of detail required in the phased scope descriptions.

16. Will the County allow a one-to-two-week extension to the proposal submission date to allow Offerors to consider among potential subcontractors?

Answer: There is adequate time for Offerors to submit a proposal by focusing on their response to the criteria factors. A time extension is not considered at this time.

17. Appendix D says “Offerors must propose one firm, fixed, fully-loaded hourly rate. The proposed fully-loaded hourly rates must include travel, per diem, fringe benefits, insurance, profit and overhead costs for contractor and personnel, as well as subcontractor personnel if appropriate.” Can you confirm whether Offerors must charge one rate for all title or can we charge different rates based on each team member’s title? Please provide detail regarding the frequency of travel for this work. Are there particular meetings or presentations where the County would appreciate or require in-person participation?

Answer: Fully loaded hourly rates can be associated by title. The selected consultant would be required to attend various meetings with county staff and presentations to the Board of County Commissioners. This would be negotiated with the selected Offeror.

18. Is the County seeking a not-to-exceed total budget or will award be based solely on hourly rates and scope? If a total budget is requested, please confirm that the County intends for this to be a time and materials contract (and not a fixed-fee contract with set milestone payments).

Answer: The award will be based on the experience and qualification factors. Cost will not be the determining factor for award, and it is not a weighted factor in the scoring.

19. Appendix D states that the proposed fully-loaded hourly rate must include costs for contractor and subcontractor personnel. To confirm, does the agency intend for Offerors to submit a single blended hourly rate covering all labor under the contract, including subcontractor labor, rather than separate hourly rates by firm? Under this structure, should subcontractor costs and profit be incorporated into the prime contractor’s proposed fully-loaded hourly rate, with no separate subcontractor rates presented to the agency?

Answer: Answer to the first question, see answer to question 17. Second question, the County is asking for a fully-loaded hourly rate including profit and overhead.

20. Regarding these preferences, does the Offeror with these qualifications need to be the prime Offeror to be awarded these additional points, or can the Offeror with these qualifications be a subcontractor? Does an Offeror with these qualifications need to represent a certain portion of the budget to be awarded the additional points?

Answer: Only the prime Offeror will be awarded preference point, but they must submit the actual preference certificate. These preference points will not apply to the budget or hourly rates.

21. The RFP indicates an “initial term of four (4) years” for the contract, but the sample agreement (Appendix E) shows a one-year term with option to extend. Which term will be

used in the final contract? Will the awarded firm have the ability to negotiate rate increases with each extension?

Answer: **A one-year term with option to extend will be used. Rates can be renegotiated for each contract term pending agreement of the department.**

22. Are the resumes, as well as licenses appended, outside the stated page limit?

Answer: **Yes.**

23. Can insurance upgrades be made upon selection?

Answer: **Yes.**

24. The RFP states resumes should be a “separate appendix.” If submitting online, should they be part of the main document, or a separate document upload? If part of the main document, do they count toward the 20 page limit?

Answer: **They can be part of the main document. They will not count toward the 20-page limit.**

25. On page 5 it states that “the feasibility study shall be completed within 365 days of the adoption of Resolution 2025-124.” It then goes on to say that “Santa Fe County intends on awarding a contract with an initial term of four (4) years.” How are these two statements to be reconciled?

Answer: **The 4-year term is standard contract language in the sample agreement. Scheduling for delivery of the feasibility study could be negotiable.**

Please add Addendum No. 2 to the original proposal documents and refer to proposal documents, hereto as such. This and all subsequent addenda will become part of any resulting contract documents and have effects as if original issued. All other unaffected sections will have their original interpretation and remain in full force and effect. Responders are reminded that any questions or need for clarification must be addressed to Ben McCormack, Procurement Specialist Senior at dmccormack@santafecountynm.gov.