

**Form QR
RFP Question Request**

Project & DB Contract: Shellmound Bridge Bundle (DB2503)

Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	TDOT Initial Response
1	Book 3, Section 6.1.3	If additional ROW is required, is the cost of ROW to be included in the price proposal?	No. The Proposer should only include any added costs to cover its ROW coordination efforts (inclusive of any additional staking for the added ROW and preparing additional appraisals) as listed under Section 6.1 in Book 3. As noted in Section 6.1.3 in Book 3, the Department will be responsible for the costs associated with "the payment to property owners for negotiated settlements, administrative settlements, and relocation benefits."
2	Book 1, Section 2.2	Please provide Form ATC for use in preparing Alternate Technical Concepts.	See the Project website, where this form was added on 12/19/2025.
3	Book 3, Section 4 paragraph 2	The Shellmound Rd. bridge base concept drawings shows 5'-0" shoulders. Should the bridge width be increased to provide 6'-0" shoulders as stated in paragraph 2?	The Design-Builder's Design Documents shall accommodate six-foot-wide shoulders, as required per Section 4 and Attachment B of Book 3. The Base Technical Concept is for information only, and RFP Book 3 takes precedence when establishing the Project's design and construction requirements.
4	Book 1, Section 1.5.5	The RFP prohibits communication with utility owners. However, at time of the technical/cost proposal due date, the Design/Build Team will develop a preliminary conflict matrix and include as part of their project schedule utility relocation timelines. Since cost and schedule are the only award criteria for technically acceptable proposers will TDOT A) allow communication with the utility companies identified in the RFP or B) hold a Pursuit Utility meeting with the identified utilities for a Q&A session with the potential proposers?	As noted in forthcoming revisions to Section 1.3 of Book 1 in the Final RFP, the Department will provide the Proposers an opportunity to ask utility-specific questions via the Form QR process. The Department will coordinate answers to the submitted questions with each utility owner, providing the responses to all Proposers when received.
5	Book 3, Section 7.2	Shall all the potential proposers include the estimated utility timeframes noted in table 6 in their project schedule including the 165 days for Utility Review?	Yes.
6	Book 3, Section 7	Will the sag height/elevation of the (TDB) Electric Transmission line crossing the West bound side of I-24 be provided?	The Department has reached out to the utility owner regarding this question, but also see the Department's response to comment #4, where the Department encourages the Proposer to ask this question through the Form QR process added to Section 1.3 of Book 1 in the Final RFP.
7	Book 3, Section 7	Has there been any discussion about the potential implications to the timeline of the project if the transmission line crossing WB I-24 is impacted by grade changes? The transmission lines potentially will be in conflict requiring relocation. With the proposers being prohibited from communicating with the utility owners, please provide an anticipated timeline for utility relocations for proposers to include in their CPM schedules.	1) Yes, there have been discussions regarding the noted transmission line. 2) As far as communication with utility owners, see the Department's response to comment #4, where the Proposer can ask this question through the Form QR process added to Section 1.3 of Book 1 in the Final RFP.
8	Book 1, Section 4.2.1.2	If the maximum number of days is included in the price proposal, the B portion of the price proposal scoring is \$3.3M. If the minimum is entered, the B portion is \$1.5M. This means the spread between maximum and minimum time is only \$1.8M. A spread this tight will not provide much incentive for designs that minimize construction time. To provide more incentive for innovative designs that minimize construction time, would the Department consider increasing the per day "cost" for the B portion?	No change at this time, but the Department is considering if a change is warranted.
9	Book 3, Section 4 paragraphs 2 and 3	Paragraph 2 states the Shellmound Road bridge over I-24 East shall accommodate future expansion of I-24 to (3) 12-ft lanes and 12-ft inside and outside shoulders. However, Paragraph 3 states the I-24 West bridge over Shellmound Road shall only accommodate (2) 12-ft lanes and 12-ft inside and outside shoulders. Per these paragraphs, if a Design-Builder proposes the minimum allowable sections, TDOT would be left with room for 3 thru lanes on I-24 East but only 2 thru lanes on I-24 West. Is this correct?	Yes, this is correct.

**Form QR
RFP Question Request**

Project & DB Contract: Shellmound Bridge Bundle (DB2503)

Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	TDOT Initial Response
10	Book 3, Section 4.3	The first bullet states that "the location of the camera...must have clear sight lines for full visibility of the bridge." There are 2 bridges in this project. Which bridge does this requirement pertain to? Should this section apply for both bridges?	See forthcoming revisions to Section 4 of Book 3 in the Final RFP, which will note the requirement for "multiple cameras" for "bridges" to capture both sites.
11	Book 3, Section 4.4	This section states that "The Design-Builder is prohibited from using blasting to demolish any section of the existing structure." Blasting is a common, well-established means of safely demolishing structures. While specifics on this project may end up make it impractical, removing the explicit prohibition of blasting would allow for more creativity and potential cost savings to TDOT. Will TDOT consider allowing blasting to demolish the structure contingent on following all applicable laws and regulations for blasting?	No change at this time.
12	Book 3, Section 3.2	The RFP states that "Any shoulder used to carry traffic during construction shall be constructed to full depth pavement equivalent to the adjacent travel lane." Is adjacent travel lane considered the existing travel lane pavement section or the proposed new pavement section?	Any shoulders carrying traffic during the construction work shall be constructed to the full-depth pavement section that is equivalent to the adjacent travel lane's proposed pavement section. See forthcoming revisions to Section 3.2 of Book 3 in the Final RFP to clarify the requirement.
13	Book 1 Section 3.2.2.1 – Construction Manager	Minimum Key Personnel Responsibilities and Qualifications states for the Construction Manager, that they must be available whenever any construction activities are being performed. Does "be available" mean physical presence on-site at these times?	Yes. See item a. under the same heading for what is required of the Construction Manager, including being "on-site whenever any construction activities are being performed."
14	Book 2 Appendix B	Appendix B lists the following Special Provisions: 105C, 109ETAG, 109ETC, 205A, 205RSS, 607CS, 610HD, 930PDA, and 940. Do this Special Provisions apply to this project?	See forthcoming revisions to Appendix B of Book 2 in the Final RFP, which will remove some of the noted special provisions.
15	Book 3, Section 6.1.4	Will the Department grant additional time if the timeframes depicted in Table 4 are exceeded and the activities are included in the baseline CPM schedule, so long as the activities are critical at the time of impact?	While blanket relief will not be granted, non-compensable time extensions may be considered for critical path delay depending on the nature of the third-party impact and consistent with TDOT change order provisions.
16	Book 3, Section 7.2	Will the Department grant additional time if the timeframes depicted in Table 6 are exceeded and the activities are included in the baseline CPM schedule, so long as the activities are critical at the time of impact?	See the Department's response to comment #15.
17	Book 3, Section 8.3.1	Will the Department grant additional time if the timeframes depicted in Table 8 are exceeded and the activities are included in the baseline CPM schedule, so long as the activities are critical at the time of impact?	See the Department's response to comment #15.

**Form QR
RFP Question Request**

Project & DB Contract: Shellmound Bridge Bundle (DB2503)

Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	TDOT Initial Response
18	Book 1, §1.5.5 "Prohibited Communications and Contingency Fee" (utility contact prohibition); Book 3, §7.1 "Design-Builder Utility Coordination Activities" (contact utility owners / Tennessee One Call expectations)	RFP Book 1 requires a Proposal CPM schedule that is "inclusive of" activities covering, among other items, "ROW" and "utility/third-party coordination." However, RFP Book 1 also states that, during the procurement period, "no Proposer... is to have any communications regarding the RFP... with... Utility companies/owners listed in Section 7 of RFP Book 3," and further states proposers are not to contact listed stakeholders regarding RFP content/Project requirements. Because utility relocations and ROW acquisition timing can materially control critical path, will TDOT do one of the following: (1) Confirm that proposers may exclude the durations and sequencing for utility coordination/relocations and ROW acquisition in the Proposal CPM schedule, so proposers are not required to develop or validate third-party/ROW timelines during procurement; or (2) If TDOT still requires utilities/ROW to be reflected in the Proposal CPM schedule, will TDOT provide baseline ROW acquisition milestone dates/assumptions and utility relocation timeline/constraint assumptions (for all impacted entities) to all proposers by addendum, so schedules are built on common, TDOT-issued information; or (3) If neither of the above, will TDOT reconsider and permit limited, nonprocurement communications (no discussion of RFP terms/pricing) solely to obtain schedule durations/constraints—either by allowing proposers to contact utility owners (and any ROW parties TDOT deems appropriate), or by authorizing a TDOT-controlled process for obtaining those durations/constraints?	See the Department's response to comment #4, where the Proposer can ask questions of the utility owners through the Form QR process added to Section 1.3 of Book 1 in the Final RFP.
19	Book 1, Section 1	Each member of the Proposer's organization with a proposed subcontract greater than or equal to \$3,000,000.00 (excluding subcontracts with suppliers). Can Talley be paving sub and be a prime?	As noted in Section 1.5 of Book 1, "no member of Proposer's organization (employees, agents, Principal Participants, Major Participants, the lead designer, Key Personnel, or the Technical Manager) may communicate with members of another Proposer's organization to give, receive, or exchange information, or to communicate inducements, that constitute anti-competitive conduct in connection with this procurement." As described, Tally would be both the Principal Participant on one team and a Major Participant on another team. Please submit protocols from both teams (for the Department's review) on how the Proposer intends to firewall itself from the various teams to confirm no conflict of interest or anti-competitive conduct occurs or could be perceived to occur in connection with this procurement.
20	Book 1, Section 1.1	130900.00: The existing I-24 Westbound bridge is a 3-span crossing over Shellmound Road with an overall structure length of 139 feet, 6 inches. The Project will design and construct a new interstate bridge to meet the minimum required vertical clearance of 16 feet 6 inches to clear the Shellmound Road typical section. The new bridge shall have two 12-foot travel lanes with 12-foot inside and outside shoulders, adhering to the I-24 typical section. The I-24 Westbound roadway approaches shall have two, 12-foot travel lanes with 12-foot inside and outside shoulders, adhering to the I-24 typical section detailed in Book 3. Does I-24 WB Bridge and Roadway have to be designed and built within the proposed future lane?	No, see Section 4 (paragraph 4) of Book 3.
21	Book 1, Section 3.4.1	Can the Design Manager Level 1 also serve as the Level 2 Design Lead?	This is at the discretion of the Proposer and will be reviewed by the DBRC to confirm qualifications.

**Form QR
RFP Question Request**

Project & DB Contract: Shellmound Bridge Bundle (DB2503)

Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	TDOT Initial Response
22	Book 2, Section 1.9.2.1	What is the approval/review time for TDOT?	See Section 2.2.1.3 of Book 3. Notwithstanding any Design-Builder resubmittals required to address the Department's comments, "ten (10) business days shall be allocated in the CPM Schedule for activities requiring the Department's Review and Acceptance or Review and Comment, unless otherwise indicated in a Special Provision or third party review."
23	Book 2, SP108B	Can rolling roadblocks be used? Can I-24 EB be detoured for bridge removal?	1) See forthcoming revisions to SP108B of Book 2 in the Final RFP. Rolling roadblocks (as approved by the Department) will be allowed. 2) There will be no allowable detours of I-24 EB.
24	Book 2, SP108B	Requests for a Shellmound Road full closure and detour approvals must be sent to the Department at least ninety (90) calendar days in advance. Can this be changed to thirty (30) days in advance? Who pays for State Troopers? If design builder must pay can TDOT provide the rate?	1) No change to the number of days for the closure notice. 2) The Department will pay for any state trooper use per its interagency agreement.
25	Book 3, Section 3.2.II	The ROW and easement lines shall be set as depicted in the Base Technical Concept. Can TDOT clarify since it was stated that all reference material provided by TDOT is for reference only?	See forthcoming revisions to Section 3.2 of Book 3 in the Final RFP, which will remove this requirement. Also the Proposer should pay attention to the requirement of Section 6.1 in Book 3 that states, "Using the Final Definitive Design (Final DD) Plans (as accepted by the Department) and in accordance with Section 6.1 of the DB Standard Guidance, the Design-Builder's Design Documents shall determine the ultimate extent of any temporary or permanent ROW needs for both bridge locations within the Project Limits..."
26	Book 3, Section 3.5.2	The Design-Builder shall propose linings for any existing corrugated metal cross drains that are to remain or be extended. The design of stormwater management facilities shall be compatible with existing or any known proposed improvements to drainage systems on adjacent properties and shall preserve existing drainage patterns. For any existing drainage structures that the Design-Builder proposes to keep in service, the Design-Builder must confirm that the existing drainage structure meets hydraulic design requirements and that it is in good condition (as verified by camera inspection) and founded on solid bedding. The Department's concurrence must be obtained to keep in service any existing drainage structure. Can TDOT define the acceptance criteria?	See forthcoming revisions to Section 3.5.2 of Book 3 in the Final RFP, which will provide additional details on acceptance criteria.

**Form QR
RFP Question Request**

Project & DB Contract: Shellmound Bridge Bundle (DB2503)

Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	TDOT Initial Response
27	Book 3, Section 4.0	The I-24 Westbound bridge over Shellmound Road shall be a new structure to accommodate a minimum of two, 12-foot-wide travel lanes and 12-foot-wide inside and outside shoulders along I-24. The I-24 Westbound bridge over Shellmound Road shall accommodate a Shellmound Road section that includes width for two, 11-foot-wide travel lanes and 6-foot-wide shoulders on both sides. The bridge shall provide a minimum vertical clearance of 16 feet and 6 inches over Shellmound Road. If the Design-Builder chooses to construct the I-24 Westbound bridge over Shellmound Road with more than 18 feet of inside shoulder width for maintenance of traffic purposes, the bridge shall be constructed with a full 22-foot-wide inside shoulder to align with the future typical section of I-24 Westbound. In such a case, the Design-Builder shall design and construct the bridge deck, foundations, and abutments to support future use of the widened shoulder as a travel lane. Is a future lane mandatory for WB I-24? Why is this 22-ft versus 24-ft?	1) No, see Section 4 (paragraph 4) of Book 3. 2) See forthcoming revisions to Section 4 of Book 3 in the Final RFP, which will clarify that the full width build out shall be 24 feet.
28	Book 3, Section 6	Can TDOT provide what limits of ROW Fence are required to be replaced?	The Design-Builder shall replace any ROW fencing impacted by its design and construction work. See forthcoming revisions to Section 6 of Book 3 in the Final RFP to clarify that intent.
29	Book 3, Section 7.1	Can the Design-Builder (or TDOT Utilities) communicate with utility owners in the pursuit phase? If not can TDOT provide relocation times for each Utility owner?	See the Department's response to comment #4, where the Proposer can ask questions of the utility owners through the Form QR process added to Section 1.3 of Book 1 in the Final RFP.
30	Book 3, Section 8.2	The Design-Builder shall perform an SQT analysis for the impacted stream and request use of the listed credits when preparing the associated water quality permit sketches, by which the Department will provide the necessary information for the Design-Builder to reference in the permit application. Can TDOT provide the SQT analysis to enable uniform scoring?	The Department does not see this as needed information since Section 8.2 of Book 3 provides an SQT average score and the Department has provided credits for the Design-Builder's use on this Project.
31	Book 3, Section 9.4	Are the detour routes considered within the project limits? Is Design Builder required to maintenance detour routes?	The Design-Builder shall maintain its detour route along Shellmound Road and the associated connector to the TVA road over the construction duration until the Shellmound Bridge over I-24 is reopened to traffic and the detour is no longer needed.
32	Book 3, Section 7, Table 5	Has coordination been performed with TVA for their overhead transmission line crossing I-24 east of Shellmound Rd? Will a TVA contact be provided in Table 5?	1) See the Department's response to comment #7. 2) See forthcoming revisions to Table 5 of Book 3 in the Final RFP, which will include contact information for TVA.
33	Book 1, Section 1.5.5	Coordination with utility companies/owners is prohibited during the procurement of the project. Since advanced coordination reduces risk by providing greater certainty in the construction schedule as well as minimizing utility conflicts, will TDOT consider revising the RFP to allow coordination with all utility owners? If advanced coordination is not allowed, will TDOT facilitate a utility owner workshop?	See the Department's response to comment #4, where the Proposer can ask questions of the utility owners through the Form QR process added to Section 1.3 of Book 1 in the Final RFP.
34	Book 3, Section 7.2	Utility relocation timeframe is listed as "Timing to be coordinated with the utility owner based on the A-Date Package". Without coordination with the utility owners during the procurement, it is difficult to incorporate these durations into the CPM schedule. Will the Department provide relocation times for all proposers to include in their submitted CPM schedule for the purposes of evaluation?	See the Department's response to comment #4, where the Proposer can ask questions of the utility owners through the Form QR process added to Section 1.3 of Book 1 in the Final RFP.

Form QR
RFP Question Request

Project & DB Contract: Shellmound Bridge Bundle (DB2503)

Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	TDOT Initial Response
35	Book 3, Section 3.5.2	Section 3.5.2 states "The Design-Builder shall replace or supplement any pipes or culverts that are deemed hydraulically or structurally deficient in the existing condition or as a result of this Project". Can the Department confirm the existing 8'x5' box culvert and existing 60" oval pipe beneath I-24 (PIN 130900.00) that are shown being extended in the TDOT base concept are structurally and hydraulically sufficient?	The Department is investigating how best address this question.
36	Reference Material, DB2503 I-24 over Shellmound BTC-Roadway.pdf, Proposed Layout	The TDOT base design shows extension of the existing 8'x5' box culvert beginning at the existing headwalls. Per TDOT STD-17-4, box culverts can be constructed with varying designs based on the depth of fill placed on top of the culvert. If design sections inadequate to handle extra fill were utilized to build the existing culvert, additional portions of the existing culvert may require removal and replacement resulting in the need for temporary shoring to support the existing travel lanes of I-24. Will TDOT confirm the culvert design section is sufficient to handle the proposed additional fill due to the widening of I-24 as indicated in the base technical concept?	The Department is investigating how best address this question.
37	Reference Material, CAD File, 581024-04-SUR-Utility.dgn	There is a 6" water main running parallel to Shellmound Road underneath the I-24 WB bridge. Minor shoulder widening along Shellmound Road is anticipated. Will TDOT confirm the utility owner allow their facility to be retained underneath proposed pavement?	See the Department's response to comment #4, where the Proposer can ask questions of the utility owners through the Form QR process added to Section 1.3 of Book 1 in the Final RFP.
38	Reference Material, DB2503 Shellmound over I-24 BTC-Roadway, Present Layout	There is a 6" water main shown crossing underneath I-24 EB. Can the Department provide as-built drawings for this facility? If I-24 EB is widened to accommodate the proposed shoulder, will casing be required?	As-builts are available in the References Documents within the "Bridge" folder on the Project website. The Design-Builder shall provide casing of any utility line crossing under the interstate per Rule 1680-6-1-.06 in the <i>TDOT Utility Manual</i> .
39	Reference Material, DB2503 Shellmound over I-24 C-list, Page 9	The approved NEPA Document notes that "In order to use this route, the connector road between TVA Road and Shellmound Rd would need to be improved. The proposed improvements would consist of asphalt overlay with striping". Can the Department provide the required pavement design and any additional signage that may be required to implement the detour?	The Design-Builder shall complete a mill and overlay prior to implementing the noted detour. Prior to this work, the Design-Builder shall propose a pavement design and necessary traffic control for the Department's approval. See forthcoming revisions to Section 9 of Book 3 in the Final RFP to clarify these details. Signing required for any proposed detour is the responsibility of the Design-Builder as noted in Section 9 of Book 3.
40	Reference Material, DB2503 Shellmound over I-24 C-list, Page 9	The proposed detour route improvement between TVA Road and Shellmound Road is not a TDOT maintained roadway and is not within TDOT right-of-way. Will TDOT perform the required coordination with the owner of the facility so that the successful Design-Builder can perform specified paving and striping operations? Has TDOT received concurrence from the owner of the facility for the proposed improvements?	Yes. The Department is investigating options to best address this question.
41	Reference Material, CAD File	Can the Department provide the ITL file utilized to create the Base Technical Concepts?	TDOT standard ORD workspace configuration files were used in the development of the Base Technical Concept.
42	Book 3, Section 3.2	If intersection sight distance cannot be provided at Piercy Road or Hass Road without vertical and horizontal adjustment to the sideroads, will the Department grant a Design Exception or Waiver to maintain the existing intersection sight distance?	As noted in Section 3.3 of Book 3, the Design-Builder may elect to submit, as applicable, a design exception or waiver, and the Department will consider each on a case-by-case basis.

Form QR
RFP Question Request

Project & DB Contract: Shellmound Bridge Bundle (DB2503)

Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	TDOT Initial Response
43	Book 3, Section 3.2	Can the Department provide design vehicle information for each roadway and sideroad to ensure appropriate sight distance checks are completed?	As noted in the <i>TDOT Roadway Design Guidelines</i> , the design vehicle shall be a S-BUS40 for all sideroads, except on Shellmound Road, where the design vehicle shall be a WB-67. The Design-Builder is responsible for meeting sight distance criteria. If sight distance criteria cannot be met, the Design-Builder may submit a design exception/waiver for approval by the Department. See forthcoming revisions to Attachment B of Book 3 in the Final RFP.
44	Book 3, Section 2.4.5	Will the Department provide the public space to hold the required Neighborhood Community Meeting? Or will the Design-Builder be responsible for securing and renting the public space?	The Department will provide the location for the meeting.
45	Reference Material, As-built Drawings	Can the Department provide as-built drawings for the hydraulic crossings?	The requested information is not available.
46	Book 3, Attachment B Roadway Design Criteria Shellmound Road at I-24 Eastbound	Section 2-101.00 of the TDOT Structural Design Guidelines states that "Bridge widths shall generally match the roadway typical section to include the traffic lanes, full width shoulders, turn lanes, medians, and the width of the top of parapets, bridge rails, and median barrier". Per Attachment B, the total roadway shoulder width of Shellmound Rd over I-24 is 6-ft. This does not align with the Base Technical Concept plans which show a bridge shoulder width of 4'-5". Can the Department clarify what the bridge shoulder width is required to be?	See the Department's response to comment #3.
47	Book 3, Section 4.4	Has TDOT performed an inspection of the existing bridge structures to determine the presence of asbestos or any other hazardous materials?	Yes. The NEPA Documents (included with the Reference Documents/Materials on the Project website) confirm that ACM is not present in either bridge.