



ADDENDUM NO. 1
RFP No. 25-26-10
Recycling Center Plan and Design Services

This Addendum is issued to provide clarification in response to questions received regarding the above-referenced Request for Proposals. The information contained herein shall be incorporated into and made part of the RFP documents. All other requirements, terms, and conditions remain unchanged.

Question: Has a physical site been identified for the project? If so, kindly forward a Boundary Survey.

Response:

Yes. A boundary survey has been completed and is available within the documents section of the RFP portal.

Question: Section IV, paragraph A, of the RFP states that GIS mapping and a Topographic Survey will be provided. Please confirm that the TOT will provide the Topographic Survey of Existing Conditions.

Response:

A topographic survey of existing conditions has not been completed but will be available upon completion.

Question: Has the Town of Taos identified a preliminary Construction Budget for the project?

Response:

No. The Town has not established a preliminary construction budget at this time. Development of cost projections is anticipated as part of the Consultant's scope of work and analysis.

Question: Will the Town of Taos publish the results of the previously advertised RFP 25-26-03 "Recycling and Composting Facility" that was conducted back in December of 2025? What is the status of this RFP?

Response:

The referenced RFP was canceled during the solicitation process, and no proposals were received.

Question: Is there any Federal funding involved in the project? Will Davis-Bacon Wage Rate apply to the construction contract?

Response:

At this time, no federal funding is associated with the project. Accordingly, Davis-Bacon wage rate requirements will not apply to the construction phase.

Question: Who are the other regional partners involved in the project?

Response:

The project is being undertaken through the Taos Regional Landfill Board, which includes the following participating entities: the Town of Taos (serving as fiscal agent), Taos County, Village of Questa, Village of Eagle Nest, Town of Red River, and Taos Ski Valley.

Question: What is the Funding Source(s) are for the \$8M they've got?

Response:

The \$8 million in project funding has been awarded through the New Mexico Department of Finance and Administration (DFA).

Question: Is the Rate Study and Financial Sustainability Analysis (described on Page 16 of the RFP) supposed to be performed for just the existing recycling operations, equipment, staff, and facilities at all present locations? Or is it also to include a second analysis and rate recommendation with all proposed and recommended recycling operations, equipment, staff, and facilities at all the proposed site and other present or proposed remote recycling locations in each community?

Response:

The analysis is expected to address both existing operations and a second scenario reflecting

proposed and recommended future conditions, including facilities, equipment, staffing, and service levels across all relevant locations.

Question: What is the budget for the rate study?

Response:

A standalone budget specific to the rate study has not been established. It is anticipated to be included within the overall project scope and cost proposal.

Question: It is our understanding that a funding application was sent to the State of New Mexico that included the request for a 3-bay collection, sorting, and bailing facility, along with preliminary geotechnical and civil engineering work resulting in some level of recycling facility design and construction documents. Could this information be shared so we have some knowledge of the work that has already been done?

Response:

The referenced funding application corresponds to the overall \$8 million award for the project. At this time, no design, engineering, or related work has been completed.

Question: In the middle of page 16 of the RFP, it lists Centralized Recycling Facility Design. Can you clarify that this work is only to include Centralized Facility Design Recommendations and Scale Recommendations for the items listed in the bullet points under that heading? Please confirm that no actual facility design plan work will be performed until the section on page 17 listed as “Final Design, Phasing Strategy, and Implementation Planning” is begun?

Response:

That is correct. The work described on page 16 is limited to design and scale recommendations. Detailed design and implementation planning activities are addressed in the subsequent section on page 17.

Question: #7 on the Schedule Form states that the Proposal Review process will begin on April 6th? Is this a typo and should it read May 6th?

Response:

Yes. This is a typographical error. The correct date for the Proposal Review process is May 6, 2026.

Question: It would be very hard to provide an accurate dollar value cost to design a new recycling facility and other remote recycling facilities in the five communities without having the results of the other work required in the proposal. Could the cost submittal include all the items included in the proposal with the exception of the actual recycling facility and remote facility design work as listed in the section on page 17 as “Final Design, Phasing Strategy, and Implementation Planning”?

Response:

The Town requests that Offerors provide cost estimates for all components of the scope of work. This will assist in understanding potential budget requirements and informing allocation decisions across project phases.

Question: If a cost for the recycling facilities design work described in question 5 is required with the proposal, could the cost for that work be expressed as a percentage of the proposed construction cost? For example, 8% of the proposed construction cost, or some other percentage? This would still allow the Board to have an estimate of the funds required for the work.

Response:

Yes. Offerors may express the cost for design services as a percentage of the estimated construction cost.

Question: Section V.A indicates that Technical Specifications (B) total 450 points and Business Specifications (C) total 550 points, with a Total Points Available listed as "TBD." However, the only Business Specifications items listed are pass/fail (Letter of Transmittal, Campaign Contribution Disclosure) and the NM Resident Preference. How is cost evaluated and weighted in the scoring? What specific criteria make up the 550 Business Specifications points? Will the Town publish a revised or complete scoring table?

Response:

Cost is not an evaluation factor for this RFP. The referenced point allocations (450 and 550) are typographical errors. The total available points are 100 and are based solely on the Technical Specifications outlined in Section V.B, which also provides descriptions of the evaluation criteria.

Question: Section IV.B.1(a) states that the narrative "must include the extent of their experience, expertise and knowledge as a provider of affordable housing services." This language appears inconsistent with the scope of this RFP, which concerns recycling and materials management facility planning. Can the Town clarify what relevant experience domain is intended here?

Response:

This requirement was included in error from a prior template and does not apply to this RFP. It has been removed.

Question: Does the Town have an established budget range or not-to-exceed amount for the professional services contemplated by this RFP? If grant funding has been secured or applied for, can the Town share the funding amount or range to help Offerors appropriately scale their proposed scope and staffing?

Response:

Based on the grant narrative, the Town has established a not-to-exceed amount of \$900,000 for professional services associated with the planning and design phase.

Question: The RFP requests a "fee schedule for services" in the Cost Proposal but does not specify a required format. Should the cost proposal be organized by task/phase consistent with the Detailed Scope of Work in Section IV.A, or does the Town prefer a rate-based format (hourly rates by personnel category), a lump-sum approach, or some other structure?

Response:

Offerors may organize their cost proposals by task or phase in alignment with the Detailed Scope of Work. A lump-sum format per task is acceptable.

Question: The scope encompasses program evaluation, rate study, facility design through construction-ready documents, environmental assessments, and implementation planning. Does the Town have an anticipated overall project duration or milestone schedule? Is the Town open to a phased approach where earlier deliverables (program evaluation, rate study) inform the scope and budget of later phases (final design, construction documents)?

Response:

An overall project duration has not yet been established. The Town is open to a phased approach, particularly where early deliverables support grant reporting requirements and inform subsequent phases.

Question: The scope requires a Phase I ESA, Class III cultural resources survey, and preliminary T&E species assessment. Does the Town have existing relationships with or preferences for specific environmental, archaeological, or biological survey firms, or should the Offeror include these subconsultants in their proposed team?

Response:

Offerors are expected to include any necessary subconsultants, including environmental, cultural, and biological specialists, as part of their proposed team.

Question: Section IV.A references audit trails, historical financial data, and process documentation that will be made available upon request. Can the Town describe the general extent and format of available data (e.g., years of financial records, existing waste characterization studies, prior facility assessments, current rate ordinances) so that Offerors can appropriately scope their data collection and analysis effort?

Response:

Relevant data, including available financial records, operational documentation, and related materials, will be provided upon request to support the Consultant's analysis. The extent and format of such data may vary, and Offerors should account for potential variability in their proposed approach.

Question: Section IV.A under "Final Design, Phasing Strategy, and Implementation Planning" requires the Consultant to "develop complete design plans suitable for competitive bidding and construction," including "engineering plans and technical specifications appropriate for procurement" and "construction-ready documents." Typically, we work in a Design-Build setting, whether the detailed drawings are left to the system provider. This represents a significant escalation from the earlier scope elements (program evaluation, rate study, conceptual facility design), which are at the planning level of professional services. Construction-ready documents and bid-ready engineering specifications typically require a defined facility program, confirmed site conditions, secured funding, regulatory approvals, and resolved design parameters, all of which are outputs of the earlier phases of this same scope. Can the Town clarify whether it expects full construction-document-level engineering (i.e., stamped drawings ready to bid) as part of this single contract, or whether the intent is for the Consultant to advance the design to a conceptual or schematic level with the understanding that final construction documents would be a subsequent phase or procurement? This distinction has substantial implications for team composition, timeline, and cost.

Response:

The Town's intent is for the Consultant to ultimately provide full construction document-level

engineering as part of the overall scope. However, the Town acknowledges that prerequisite planning, analysis, and preliminary design work must be completed first. Accordingly, the Town is amenable to structuring this effort in a phased manner, whereby the development of construction-ready documents would occur following completion of earlier project phases.