



## RFP 25MCO649

### In response refer to RFP No. 25MCO649 Addendum 1 and Response to Questions

June 12, 2025

Gentlemen/Ladies:

It has been brought to our attention that there were some discrepancies to quantities in the original bid tab. These discrepancies have been addressed in this Addendum with the issuance of the corrected bid tab and bid alternate forms in the revised specification. This Addendum also includes a revised set of drawings.

The following questions have been asked according to the instructions of the bid and are hereby answered.

1. Sta 0+80 (roughly), to relocate Electric Pedestal? Where does it have to be relocated?  
**Electric pedestal is to be relocated to the edge of the ROW.**
2. Sta 34+90 Solar Panel to be relocated Where does it have to be relocated?  
**Contractor to coordinate with the Landowner for placement.**
3. Are utilities being replaced by others? (Gas Valve, surface pipe, guy wires, power poles)  
**Yes.**
4. Is PGL on Plan & Profile proposed centerline?  
**Yes.**
5. Are concrete sleeper slabs required at the end of the concrete pavement? If yes, please provide a detail.  
**No.**
6. Please verify the rumble trip quantity.  
**Rumble Strip quantity is 1,625 LF. See revised bid tab.**
7. Will rumble strips be required down the middle and on both sides where rumble strips are shown?  
**Rumble Strips are only required on the East side of the roadway.**

8. Please verify solar power LED stop signs. Sheets 48 and 49 show two each, a total of 4.  
The bid tab has been updated. See revised bid tab for updated quantities.
9. For Sta 00+0 – 4+00 calls for 5” HMAC, would it be possible to use 3” and 2”?  
Yes. See revised plans for section for STA 0 to 4+00.
10. Would it be possible to ask additional questions when the addendum is issued.  
No.
11. There is a discrepancy in the quantities of the RCBS of Bid Item 24 – 936 LF, plan calls out for 990LF.  
990 LF is correct. See corrected bid tab.
12. There is a discrepancy in the quantities of the RCBS of Bid Item 25 – 241 LF, plan calls out for 260 LF.  
260 LF is correct. See corrected bid tab.
13. There is a discrepancy in the quantities of the RCBS of Bid Item 27 – 9 EA, plan calls out for 18 EA.  
18 EA is correct. See corrected bid tab.
14. There is a discrepancy in the quantities of the RCBS of Bid Item 28 – 2 EA, plan calls out for 4 EA.  
4 EA is correct. See corrected bid tab.
15. There is a discrepancy in the quantities of the RCBS of Bid Item 29 – 1 EA, plan calls out for 2 EA.  
2 EA is correct. See corrected bid tab.
16. Can you provide the BCS sheets to price out the correct SET?  
Generally, TxDOT BCS plan sheets are specifically designed for and primarily used on projects managed and constructed by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT). The TxDOT BCS sheet is not being provided in the Midland County plans as this is not a TxDOT project, and the contractor has the option to choose whether they want to construct precast or cast-in-place culverts.
17. Will there be Cattle/livestock on site?  
We will coordinate with the landowner to confirm. There is one planned cattle crossing. Details are included. Location is to be coordinated with the landowner.
18. Will the cattle guards need to be removed by the contractor?  
Yes.

19. Are there any fence gate details?  
Yes, refer to Sheet 10.
20. Energy Transfer pipeline cap detail is too small to read in plans. Can it be resized?  
Yes. See revised plans.
21. What is the diameter of the Plains pipeline?  
The pipeline is 16". However, the pipe cap needs to span their ROW, which is 30'.
22. Is the contractor responsible for removing the water well and solar panel?  
Yes.
23. Regarding the 5" TY D HMAC for the TxDOT connection, contractor concerns with pavement rutting due to heavy trucks. Suggest Using 2" TY D Surface Course Over 3" TY (B or C) Bottom Course?  
The section is from the Geotech report. I will double check and see if they have an alternative that is acceptable (see question and answer to No. 9 above).
24. Can the water well be used for construction?  
Yes.
25. Is there a Geotech Report?  
Yes. See bid packet.
26. Is there access now to the project site to look at?  
No, there are gates at both ends.
27. Can you clarify prep of ROW - is it to the fence or further?  
Prep ROW for Anetta is the full 120' ROW.
28. Is there a curb at the tie-in to Anetta?  
Plans currently show 2 short runs on Anetta connecting to the roundabout.
29. At Station 30+00 on Anetta is the fence removal still valid?  
The fence is no longer there.
30. There is no Fence Removal quantity being shown as a bid item?  
Fence Removal is included as a part of Preparation of ROW.
31. Is the new fence close to the power poles?  
Yes. Fence has been modified to get better clearance. See revised sheets.
32. Can the fence line be staked?  
Yes. It will be staked before construction.

33. Why is there a fence through the Anetta intersection with Avalon?

Fence has been added to prevent vehicles from travelling through the Anetta intersection with Avalon until this section has been officially opened. The time of when this will happen has not been determined.

34. Can the concrete section be expanded through the Avalon connection?

Yes. See revised sheets.

35. Should there be an end of road sign at the connection of 1250 and Anetta?

Yes. See revised sheets.

36. Is TxDOT Bid Item No. 340 still being used or is it being replaced?

The TxDOT Bid Item No. 340 called out in the plans is being replaced with Bid Item No. 341. Refer to revised plans and bid item qty's.