



December 12, 2025

Addendum No. 2

RFP Number: 26-T003

Title: North Texas MOVES BUILD GRANT- TRE Double Tracking Construction Project

This Addendum is issued to answer the submitted questions. **Answers are in RED******

1. Existing Bridge MP 621.06 is to be replaced. Details on Sheet 22 note this as an existing concrete bridge. Details on Sheet 229 note this as an existing timber bridge. Please verify. **It is a timber bridge**
2. Please confirm all track and signals will be removed by others (TRE track and systems contractor). Confirm this is to include all special track work removal, proposed track shift at the Richland station, and removal of the track on the existing bridges that are to be remove and replaced. **This is correct**
3. To what extent is the Richland Hills Station to be removed? What depth do the existing foundations need to be removed? Section 02050 note between 12" below final grade and 1'-6" below permanent ground line. Are there any existing utility modifications at the station that will be needed after removal? Are there any concerns with lead or asbestos at this location? **The platform, grade beam, and anything else within 4' from top of current platform. Typical section on sheet 39 shows the platform, based on the record drawings which will be provided. The anticipated utilities include drain pipes and electrical conduit. No concerns with lead or asbestos.**
4. Are as-built drawings available for the Richland Hills Station that is to be removed? **Yes, they will be provided.**
5. The contractor is required to follow specification '02316' for the Geotechnical Instrumentation as noted in Bid Item 40030. Please provide Specification '02316'. **Specification provided.**
6. In Addendum 1, Question #10, proposers are instructed to disregard providing a preliminary baseline schedule, and reference to submitting a baseline schedule under separate cover in Appendix A was struck from the RFP. However, within the 8 point subsection of Section A Schedule and Cost Control, proposers are still instructed to "provide a detailed project schedule..." Please clarify if proposers are required to still submit a detailed project schedule within this section of the proposal, and if so, please confirm if the project schedule is counted within the 50 page limit. **A schedule is required**

and will not count towards the 50 page limit. Schedule should include enough detail to indicate project understanding and ability to deliver the project within the schedule or not.

7. Sheets 7 and 8 contains the general notes, It appears sheet 2 of 3 is missing, please provide the missing sheet. **There is not a 2 of 3, the title of those should be 1 of 2 and 2 of 2. Revised sheets will be issued for IFC.**
8. For this project, will it be determined that phase 3 will be the substantial completion for the project? Phase 4 only has work pertaining to the TRE track contractor. **Substantial completion for the civil contract will be granted once the elements have been accepted for track and signal work to begin.**
9. General Provisions has been referenced multiple times in the RFP document and Specification of the project. However, the actual General Provisions were not provided with the project documents. Please provide the General Provisions document. **Response to be provided with the next round of questions on December 19, 2025.**
10. Following the phasing specifications on sheets C-221 through C224, to determine a proper schedule and duration for the project with proper staffing and general conditions, schedule durations for the TRE track contractor will be needed for each phase of work that will impact the work for this project. – **Response to be provided with the next round of questions on December 19, 2025.**
 - Phase 1 – TRE track contractor to:
 - Permanently discontinue rail operations on mainline track 2 and remove existing rail. Please provide the Duration.
 - Shift Ballasted track from Richland Hills station through existing left hand turn out. Please provide the Duration.
 - Phase 2 – TRE track contractor to:
 - Remove Turn outs at STA: 45+97.86 & 52+46.37 & 146+00. Please provide the Duration
 - Construct new turnouts at STA: 45+97.86 & 52+46.37 & 146+00 Please provide the Duration
 - Install new mainline track 2 from STA: Richland Hills Station to 45+97.86 & 52+46.37 to 146+00. Please provide the Duration
 - Remove Curve Track. Please provide the Duration
 - Phase 3 – TRE track contractor to:
 - Shift rail operations on to Mainline 2. Please provide the Duration
 - West Turn out east of Big Fossil Creek. Please provide the Duration
 - East End 4ea turn outs. Please provide the Duration
 - Shift Track on Mainline 1 from STA 53+00 to 71+49.48. Please provide the Duration.
11. Is contractor responsible for determining waste site for the creosote treated lumber on the existing bridges that are planned to be removed or will TRE provide the waste site at their expense? **Waste site will be the responsibility of the Civil Contractor**
12. During Phases 2 and 3, when TRE installs new ballast and rail and shifts the existing alignment onto the new alignment, is the civil contractor expected to demobilize and then remobilize once TRE's work is complete? If the demobilization is not required what is scheduled standby time? **Track has indicated 1 month duration to get the track installed.**

13. Please provide the connection detail for H-piles connecting to the precast pile cap. - Details of the connection for the H-piles to the precast pile cap are on sheet 239. The H-piles are all around fillet welded to the embed plate in the bottom of the precast pile cap.
14. When calling out an abandon and “plug and fill with CDF,” and the plan points to nothing, what exactly is supposed to be filled? – 34’ of 18” steel pipe from area inlet to be removed to the end treatment just above the callout.
15. Note 3 refers to a proposed outfall detail on sheet 209, but none is shown. Where is this detail located? – The ballast drain end detail is on sheet 210
16. Pile notes Carboline Bitumatic 300M or approved alternative to be applied to the H piles and bracing. Is this coating to be required on the permanent shoring for bid item 40029? - Yes, the permanent shoring for bid item 40029 shall receive Carboline Bitumatic 300M or approved alternative similar to the H-piles.
17. Are the CAD files available for the project? If so, please provide the CAD files? – Contractor may request CAD Files from Beshimanek@gftinc.com and must copy Richey.Thompson@ridetm.org and contractmgmt@ridetm.org.
18. Culvert C proposed Rock Riprap plan view shows a 18' by 40' area of rock riprap that extends 9' past the existing TRE ROW. In Culvert C's section view, the rock riprap is shown to start 4' past the existing ROW limits thus creating a 5.5' section of rock rip rap. Please confirm rock rip rap dimensions for Culvert C. – Plan view limits are correct, 18'x40'.
19. Typical Section DWG 37, C-125 notes Flume Station Range of STA 40+00 to STA 44+00 but DWG 45, C-133 shows concrete flume starting at STA 40+00 and Ending STA 42+25. Please confirm Concrete Flume length to be 225 LF including transitions to match Wall RW06 ending station and not typical section stationing call out for 400 LF. – Flume is from 40+00 to 42+25.
20. The contract documents indicate that the contractor is responsible for the design of the stairs. Historically and per typical industry practice, the architect of record provides the architectural stair design. Please confirm whether the intent of the contract documents is to delegate full stair design—including architectural layout and code compliance—to the contractor, or if the architect and structural engineer will be providing the design intent and requirements as part of the construction documents. – Based on discussions during walk through, stairs are no longer needed due to the signal house being moved to Precinct Line.
21. All of the reference callouts on the bridge plan sheet seems to have an error, will that be corrected on the upcoming addendum? – DWG No. references will be updated and revised sheets will be provided.
22. There is no bid item for sealant ballast that goes behind the abutment, please confirm if that will be picked up by TRE or item will be provided for sealant ballast. If contractor is furnishing it, please provide the details such as gradation requirements. - The bid item for structural backfill at abutments includes the sealant ballast shown on the abutment details. Structural backfill with

sealant ballast shall have AREMA No. 4 gradation per the table in AREMA.

Roadway and Ballast

Table 1-2-2. Recommended Ballast Gradations

Size No. (See Note 1)	Nominal Size Square Opening	Percent Passing									
		3"	2½"	2"	1½"	1"	¾"	½"	¼" f ⁹	No. 4	No. 8
24	2½" - ¾"	100	90-100		25-60		0-10	0-5	–	–	–
25	2½" - 3/8"	100	80-100	60-85	50-70	25-50	–	5-20	0-10	0-3	–
3	2" - 1"	–	100	95-100	35-70	0-15	–	0-5	–	–	–
4A	2" - ¾"	–	100	90-100	60-90	10-35	0-10	–	0-3	–	–
4	1½" - ¾"	–	–	100	90-100	20-55	0-15	–	0-5	–	–
5	1" - 3/8"	–	–	–	100	90-100	40-75	15-35	0-15	0-5	–
57	1" - No. 4	–	–	–	100	95-100	–	25-60	–	0-10	0-5

Note 1: Gradation Numbers 24, 25, 3, 4A and 4 are main line ballast materials. Gradation Numbers 5 and 57 are yard ballast materials.

23. Plan Sheet 211 The level pad detail Section AA doesn't have the size. Plan Sheet 212 shows the depth not the width. Please provide the width dimension. - **The width should be 1'.**

24. The grading plan sheets note 1 says the proposed contours represent proposed top of subgrade within track bed limits. Is the top of subgrade beneath the subballast? – **This is the same as the bottom of subballast**

25. Plan Sheet 197 and 198 at station 14+20 give two different existing grade elevations please confirm the correct one. - **The Existing Grade Elevations are incorrect on Sheet 197. These will be corrected in an addendum.**

26. There appears to be an unmarked water line and electrical lines on Precinct Line Rd based on hydrants and light poles. Does the engineer have any information on the location and depths of these lines? – **Response to be provided in the next round of questions on December 19, 2025.**

27. Temp shoring appears to be depicted as a sheet pile on bridge plan sheets. Sheet pile is a cost saving option, but standardly vibrated, but the note on the pile plans mentions Vibratory hammers are not allowed. Does this note only apply to driving bearing piles? Please confirm if the sheet pile method of temp/permanent shoring is allowed. **Vibratory restrictions are for bearing piles only.**

28. On Sheets 58, the riprap appears to be concrete (based on the symbol legend provided on sheet 4) however, on sheet 231 the riprap calls out to be a stone riprap. Please clarify which riprap type should be priced, if there are both, please provide the limits of both types of riprap. – **Stone riprap to be used underneath and wrapping around the bridge**

29. The grading sheets have multiple elevations on contour lines. An example of this being on sheet 64 where the southern grading limits between STA 0+25 & STA 7+00 showing the elevations 536, 537, 538, & 535 on a single contour (this is not the only location where this is shown). Can the sheets be revised to show which elevation is correct for each proposed contour? – **Contour labels will be cleaned up and issued in revised plan sheets**

30. Grading sheets 61 & 73 have instances of incorrect station numbers at the matching lines. On sheet 66, the top and bottom matching lines show STA 31+00 and on sheet 73 the top and bottom matching lines show STA 142+00. Will this be corrected in the next addendum? – **Plan views are in proper order, the bottom left match line stationing should match the top right. Match line stationing to be updated**

31. There is no information on the liquidated damages related to the Substantial or Final Completion. Please confirm if there are any provisions regarding these liquidated damages. – **Contractor shall pay to Trinity Metro the sums set forth below for each calendar day of delay in completion of the Work within the time established in the contract. Any liquidated damages assessed shall be cumulative. These Liquidated Damages are a reasonable estimate of potential damages to Trinity Metro which are uncertain at this time and could be uncertain at the time such damages would be incurred. Should the amount of liquidated damages exceed the amount owed to Contractor on the Contract, Contractor is required to pay those excess liquidated damages to Trinity Metro. Liquidated damages shall be assessed in the amount of \$1,400.00 for each calendar day of delay for Contractor's failure to meet "project deadlines. This shall be negotiated and defined in the final contract execution with the awardee.**

32. In the Geotech Report Table 7 Summary of proposed retaining wall information has RW-04 deleted however, in the plan sheet S-005, RW-04 still exists. Please Clarify if this wall has been deleted. **This wall has not been removed.**

33	ID#	Document / Reference Clause	Query/Request
34.		TRE Double Track IFB Specification	Can specification 02316 Geotechnical Instrumentation be provided to allow for correct settlement and monitoring equipment to be included in proposal. Specification provided.
35.		TRE Double Track IFB Specification	Will Trinity Metro accept precast materials designed in accordance with AREMA standards as an alternative to the specified TxDOT requirements? Yes
36.		TRE Double Track IFB Specification Section 01560 1.8 F2	Section 01560 1.8 F2 states that "the Contractor shall erect a temporary fence at the Mitchell Cemetery site", however upon investigation, the site is located some distance from the project site. Please confirm the location of the cemetery and if this fencing is required? This is an error. No cemetery in the vicinity of the project.
37.		TRE Double Track IFB Specification General	Can Trinity Metro confirm that bridge construction is referred to applicable AREMA standards, and that there are no project-specific standards beyond those provided? – This is correct

38.		TRE Double Track Bid Form	Can the line item 40014 detailed as "Set Type II" please be confirmed as to scope? – Downstream end treatment for Culvert E at Precinct Line.
39.		TRE Double Track IFB Specification	Can Trinity Metro confirm that the Contractor is to design and provide submittals for the precast Fascia Panels? Does Trinity Metro have any requirements for finish, color, stamping or textures etc.? – Contractor will need to produce and submit shop drawings/submittals for approval, and TM has no requirements for finish, color, stamping or textures, etc.
40.		TRE Double Track IFB Plans, General	Can the existing as-built drawings for the Richland Hills station platform and pedestrian panels be provided for demolition estimates? Yes.
	41.	TRE Double Track IFB Specification Section 01500	Can Trinity Metro provide use of existing Richland Hills station carparks (2721 Handley Ederville Rd, listed under Fort Worth Transportation Authority) as office site for the Project duration? Yes
	42.	TRE Double Track IFB Plans, C-110	Confirming that callout note "Existing concrete Bridge MP 621.06 (To be replaced)" is a typo only? Correct.
	43.	TRE Double Track IFB Specification Section 01560 1.13	Does Trinity Metro's Facility require a specified level of security that is to be maintained 24/7 by the Contractor? No requirements, responsibility of the Contractor.
	44.	TRE Double Track IFB Plans, General	Can Trinity Metro provide the IFB (or latest) digital files/model for the project? - Contractor may request CAD Files from Beshimanek@gftinc.com and must copy Richey.Thompson@ridetm.org and contractmgmt@ridetm.org.
	45.	TRE Double Track IFB Plans, C-129	Does Trinity Metro (or designers) have information of indicative depth of the gas main (PL2) in proximity with retaining walls, or anticipate a conflict in this area between the RW footings? – The gas line in this area has about 5' of cover. The retaining wall will be shifted closer to the ROW and not be on top of the gas line. Revised sheet to come.

A final addendum will be issued on Friday, December 19, 2025, to address all final questions and clarifications.

ALL TERMS OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL REMAIN THE SAME UNLESS CHANGED THROUGH A WRITTEN AMENDMENT TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL. NO ORAL CHANGES ARE BINDING. CHANGE REQUESTS MUST BE IN THE FORM OF A WRITTEN REQUEST TO BE ANSWERED IN A WRITTEN ADDENDUM.

RESPONDANTS MUST ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM IN THE FORM 1 IN THEIR PROPOSAL. FAILURE TO DO SO MAY INVALIDATE THE PROPOSAL

End of Addendum # 2