



Purchasing Services Office
801 Leroy Place
Socorro, NM 87801
(575) 835-6168

Letter of Addendum

TO: All Offerors
FROM: Meradeth Montoya, Associate Director of Purchasing
DATE: 10/09/2026
RE: RFP Number: RFP #27090006 - Amendment No. 3
Commodity: Statewide Aquifer Monitoring Well Prioritization Project

Q1: Section 15.1, Task 1, Items 1-2 (Page 11): Will NMBGMR provide existing groundwater monitoring databases, GIS layers, regional hydrogeologic studies, water-use datasets, and previous planning documents in electronic format at project initiation?

A1: Yes. NMBGMR will provide available digital information and datasets from several internal and external sources at project initiation. The selected contractor is expected to conduct additional research to ensure a thorough assessment of other relevant sources.

Q2: Section 15.4, Task 4, Item 1 (Page 12): Are the five virtual and two in-person meetings identified in the RFP intended to represent all Working Group meetings anticipated for the project, or should proposers include additional meetings as needed?

A2: Offerors may include additional Working Group meetings in their proposals if deemed necessary to accomplish the project objectives.

Q3: Section 15.2, Task 2, Item 1 (Page 12): Has NMBGMR previously developed draft monitoring-well prioritization criteria or evaluation factors that will be provided to the selected consultant?

A3: Please refer to NMBGMR Open-File Report 624 as an example:
<https://geoinfo.nmt.edu/publications/openfile/details.cfm?Volume=624>. This project will use similar criteria while also seeking community input to identify regional priorities.

Q4: Sections 15.2, Task 2, and 15.3, Task 3 (Page 12): Is the intent to identify conceptual candidate locations at a planning level, or should site recommendations include parcel-specific screening and landownership considerations?

A4: Site recommendations should be as specific as possible and, to the extent feasible, include evaluations of access arrangements, land ownership, and permitting requirements.

Q5: Section 15.3, Task 3, Items 1-2 (Page 12): For candidate monitoring well locations, should feasibility evaluations be limited to desktop due diligence addressing land ownership, environmental constraints, cultural resources, access considerations, and permitting requirements, or are more detailed site-specific evaluations anticipated?

A5: Feasibility evaluations are limited to desktop assessments. More detailed field-based site evaluations are not anticipated under this task.

Q6: Section 15.3, Task 3, Items 1-3 (Page 12): For Task 3, is the consultant expected to identify permitting pathways and requirements at a planning level, or prepare permit-level analyses sufficient to support future implementation?

A6: The consultant should provide site-specific information and identify applicable permitting requirements, to the extent feasible through desktop research, to support future implementation.

Q7: Section 15.5, Item 3, and Section 15.6, Required Deliverables (Pages 12-13): Are there existing NMBGMR Open File Reports that should be used as templates for organization, formatting, and content expectations?

A7: NMBGMR Open-File Reports are published in various formats. Examples are available at <https://geoinfo.nmt.edu/publications/openfile/home.cfm>. An Open-File Report is one possible format for the final deliverable. The selected consultant may work with NMBGMR staff at project initiation to establish an outline and content expectations consistent with publication requirements.

Q8: Section 15.6, Required Deliverables (Pages 12-13): In addition to maps and metadata, should GIS deliverables include geodatabases, web-based mapping products, or other digital decision-support tools?

A8: GIS deliverables shall include all background data, associated metadata, and geodatabases. Web-based mapping products and digital decision-support tools are not expected as final deliverables.

Q9: Section 10.1 and Section 15.8 (Pages 9 and 13): Is the project intended to be completed under the initial one-year contract period, with renewals available if needed, or is performance through April 2028 anticipated to require exercise of one or more renewal terms?

A9: The current funding source has a deadline of May 2028. An extension from the granting agency is neither guaranteed nor anticipated. Offerors should plan their proposed schedule accordingly.

Q10: Section 4.1.1, Cost, and Section 15.9, Cost Proposal Guidelines (Pages 5 and 13): Should the cost proposal provide labor rates by labor category only, or should costs also be allocated by task and/or regional group?

A10: Costs shall be allocated by task and shall identify the applicable labor categories and corresponding labor rates. A breakdown by regional group is not required.

Q11: Proposal Forms (Page 14): Are Offerors required to complete, sign, and return the sample Professional Services Agreement (PSA), including the conflict of interest/debarment certification (Page 23) and the lobbying/Clean Air Act/Federal Water Pollution Control Act certification (Page 24), with their proposal or only upon award?

A11: The sample PSA and its associated certifications are not required to be completed and signed with the proposal. The PSA will be completed and executed at project initiation following award. All other required proposal forms must be submitted as instructed in the RFP.

Q12: Please clarify the anticipated contract type for this procurement (e.g., firm-fixed-price, time-and-materials with a not-to-exceed amount, labor-hour, or other). In addition, please identify the preferred format for cost proposal submission and evaluation. If a standardized bid schedule, cost proposal form, schedule of values, or pricing template is required or preferred, will NMIMT provide such a format?

A12: Offerors shall propose a time-and-materials contract with a not-to-exceed amount. The cost proposal shall identify labor categories, hourly rates, estimated hours and costs by task, and the total proposed not-to-exceed amount.

ALL OFFERORS ARE REQUIRED TO CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS AMENDMENT IN THEIR RESPONSE. ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.