



PORT OF HARLINGEN AUTHORITY

Port of Harlingen Authority Railyard Industrial Park Development

RFQ No. 2026-01

July 23, 2026

Questions Answered

1. Please clarify whether the Respondent must identify and commit the construction contractor that will serve as the prime Design-Builder at the RFQ stage, whether a qualified engineering/design firm may submit as the Respondent and finalize the design-build contracting structure before the RFP, and whether the Owner has a preferred structure such as a single-entity prime, joint venture, or other design-build arrangement. Please also clarify which subcontractors and key personnel must be committed at the RFQ stage and the process for approving later team changes or substitutions. **(LJA)**

No, the respondent does not have to identify and commit the construction contractor that will serve as the prime Design-Builder at the RFQ stage. Yes, qualified engineering/design firm may submit as the Respondent and finalize the design-build contracting structure before the RFP.

All subcontractors and key personnel must be committed at the RFQ stage that you intend to have on the project. The process for approving later team changes and substitutions will be determined at a later stage with the selected firm.

2. Please clarify the components included within the stated \$15,000,000 total PDB project budget. Specifically, does the budget include Phase 1 design and preconstruction services, final design, construction, Design-Builder fees, escalation, contingency, Union Pacific costs, utility relocations, environmental mitigation, testing, commissioning, and other project delivery costs? **(LJA)**

Yes, this estimate includes costs for all components of pre-construction, final design and construction of project.

3. Please clarify the anticipated commercial structure for Phase 1 and the process for establishing and authorizing Phase 2. Does the Owner anticipate a Guaranteed Maximum Price, lump-sum price, or other pricing structure; at what level of design development will the Phase 2 price be established; and what process will apply if the Owner and Design-Builder cannot agree on Phase 2 scope, schedule, or price? Please also describe anticipated rights to use Phase 1 design documents following any such off-ramp. **(LJA)**

The structures for Phase 1 and the process for establishing and authorizing are to be included and determined in the scope of work by the selected firm.

Yes, a Guaranteed Maximum Price is anticipated.

The level of design development that the Phase 2 price will be established is to be determined by the firm selected.

The process should the Owner and Design-Builder not agree on Phase 2 scope, schedule, or price is to be determined on a case-by-case basis should the situation arise.

All rights and documents from this project are owned by the Port of Harlingen.

4. Section 1 (Page 1), under the Phase 1 deliverables, the third bullet point lists "Cost modeling, Guare and schedule development." Could the Port please confirm if "Guare" is a typographical error intended to mean "Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP)"? **(Burns & McDonnell; RailWorks Track Systems, LLC)**

Yes, that is a typographical error, and we confirm that intended meaning is Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP)

5. Please clarify the intended term and requirement associated with the Phase 1 scope item stating "Cost modeling, Guare and schedule development," and confirm the specific deliverables and expected level of completion associated with the approximately 60% preliminary engineering milestone. **(LJA)**

The selected firm will determine cost modeling, guaranteed maximum price and schedule development," and confirm the specific deliverables and expected level of completion associated with the approximately 60% preliminary engineering milestone through the project scope of work proposal.

6. Please describe the current status of coordination with Union Pacific Railroad, including prior meetings, correspondence, conceptual approvals, service-planning

discussions, identified connection locations, or preliminary requirements. Have any preliminary concepts been reviewed with UPRR? Has UPRR identified any capacity, operational, or constructability concerns? **(LJA; Lone Star Railroad Contractors, Inc.)**

There have been no prior discussions with Union Pacific Railroad.

7. Please also clarify the anticipated division of responsibility and cost between the Design-Builder and UPRR for mainline turnout work, signal modifications, flagging, inspections, work within UPRR right-of-way, and other force-account or reimbursable railroad activities. **(LJA)**

Division of responsibility will be determined with the selected firm after the RFQ is awarded.

8. Has the Port established target operating criteria for Phase 1, including anticipated railcars per day or week, interchange train length, required staging or storage capacity, switching method, number or type of future tenants, and desired turnaround time? Please provide any available operating plan or basis of design and clarify the intended meaning and requirements associated with the RFQ statement to consider the potential for “railcar stage” in Phase One. **(LJA)**

The components for Phase 1 will be determined as part of the project scope of work with the selected firm.

9. The conceptual site plan shows multiple alternatives, including 50-car and 100-car interchange configurations, switch-lead concepts, an east-side connection, future crossovers, and potential improvements to existing Port track. Please clarify whether all concepts remain viable for Phase 1 evaluation, whether any have been preferred or eliminated, and the anticipated ultimate build-out criteria that should govern future expandability. Is there a preferred alternative already identified? **(LJA; Lone Star Railroad Contractors, Inc.)**

All the alternatives are only conceptual and can be part of but not limited to as part of the project scope of work determined by the selected firm. There is no preferred alternative identified.

10. Please identify the existing information that will be provided to the selected Design-Builder, including the Port Master Plan, prior rail studies, conceptual layouts,

operations analyses, cost estimates, surveys, subsurface utility information, geotechnical reports, drainage studies, environmental studies, utility mapping, and correspondence with UPRR. Please also clarify which additional survey, SUE, geotechnical, environmental, and other data collection services are expected to be performed by the Design-Builder versus separately procured or funded by the Port. Is current geotechnical information available for the project site? If not, is subsurface investigation expected to be performed as part of the Progressive Design-Build scope? **(LJA; Lone Star Railroad Contractors, Inc.)**

All documents available by the Port of Harlingen will be provided to the firm selected and necessary data and related services necessary are to be determined by the selected firm. Specifically geotechnical information and utility mapping or record information is not available and the subsurface investigation is expected to be a part of the scope of work.

- 11.** What level of site control does the Port currently have for the proposed project area? Please clarify the limits of property currently owned or controlled by the Port and identify any portions of the conceptual alternatives that may require acquisition of right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, access rights, or other third-party property interests. **(LJA; Lone Star Railroad Contractors, Inc.)**

The Port of Harlingen Authority owns the site. The limits of the property are displayed on the RFQ Site Map. No right-of-way acquisitions, easements, access rights or other are anticipated.

- 12.** Please identify the anticipated project funding sources and any associated federal or state requirements, including potential NEPA or other environmental review, Build America Buy America or Buy America requirements, Davis-Bacon requirements, grant-specific conditions, or other compliance obligations, funding-related milestones or deadlines that may affect project delivery? Please also identify the anticipated environmental lead agency and any completed or ongoing cultural, historical, wetlands, threatened and endangered species, or other environmental investigations. Can you provide a list of the permits and agencies expected for this location by The Port? **(LJA; Lone Star Railroad Contractors, Inc.; RailWorks Track Systems, LLC)**

The Port of Harlingen anticipates utilizing state and federal grant funding as available for this project, which will determine requirements and regulations as

stipulated as part of the grant agreements. However, there are currently no state or federal funding tied to this project at the moment.

The identification of the anticipated agencies is to be determined by the selected firm in the project scope of work.

- 13.** Please identify known drainage, floodplain, stormwater, utility, and other major site-development constraints, including available discharge points and known existing or proposed utilities. Please also clarify whether utility relocations and related third-party costs are expected to be included within the \$15,000,000 PDB project budget. **(LJA)**

These are to be determined in the site development process of the project by the selected firm.

- 14.** Section 5 (Page 6) of the RFQ states a maximum length of 16 pages and notes that limited 11" x 17" format foldouts are allowed. Could the Port please clarify if an 11" x 17" foldout will count as one (1) page or two (2) pages toward the 16-page maximum limit? **(Burns & McDonnell)**

An 11"x17" format foldouts are allowed and will count as one (1) page toward the 16-page maximum limit.

- 15.** Please confirm that all items listed under "Appendices," including resumes, financial statements, bonding information, safety information, acknowledgements, and optional contract comments, are excluded from the 16-page SOQ limit, and identify any page limits applicable to individual appendices. **(LJA)**

No, appendices are not counted as part of the 16-page SOQ limit. Reference: RFQ in Section 5: SOQ Submission Requirements, Submission Format, "Maximum length: 16 pages (excluding transmittal letter & appendices)"

- 16.** Section 6 (Pages 6-7) references requirements for performance bonds, payment bonds, and insurance certificates. Because this is a progressive design-build procurement where the final construction scope, schedule, and Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) will not be defined or executed until the completion of Phase 1 (Preconstruction/Design Services), actual payment and performance bonds cannot be issued at this qualifications stage. Would the Port please confirm that submitting a Letter of Bondability from an A-rated, Treasury-listed surety company and a Letter of Insurability

from our insurance broker is acceptable and fully responsive for the Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) submittal? **(LJA; Burns & McDonnell)**

Yes, a surety letter confirming bonding capacity is sufficient at the SOQ stage.

- 17.** Please also describe the process, if any, for identifying or submitting confidential financial information given the applicability of the Texas Public Information Act. **(LJA)**

All information submitted for the SOQ is subject to the Texas Public Information Act. However, the Port of Harlingen and the RFQ are not requesting any confidential information, only audited financial statements.

- 18.** Beyond acknowledgement of compliance with the Port's Social Equity Policy, are there specific participation goals, reporting requirements, outreach requirements, or evaluation considerations associated with disadvantaged, minority-owned, women-owned, small, or historically underutilized businesses? **(LJA)**

No, not for the SOQ process. However, this may be required of the selected firm through a grant utilized for project funding.

- 19.** Will the Owner provide a draft Progressive Design-Build contract for review before the SOQ deadline or with the RFP, and will optional contract comments submitted with the SOQ affect qualifications scoring or shortlisting? Additionally, does the Owner anticipate providing a stipend or honorarium to shortlisted teams that submit responsive RFP proposals? **(LJA)**

Yes, a draft of the Progressive Design-Build contract will be provided for review before the SOQ deadline. No comments will not affect qualifications or shortlisting.

No, a stipend or honorarium will not be provided to shortlisted candidates/ finalists for this RFP proposal.

- 20.** What is the desired execution timeline once a firm has been selected? **(Lone Star Railroad Contractors, Inc.)**

Timelines of the project are to be determined by the selected firm, however, the Port of Harlingen is looking for an execution as soon as possible.

21. Are firms allowed to be on more than one Team for this SOQ? (Lone Star Railroad Contractors, Inc.)

Yes, firms are allowed to be on more than one team for this SOQ.