

**Form QR**  
**RFP Question Request**

**Project & DB Contract: Shellmound Bridge Bundle (DB2503)**

Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	TDOT Response
1	RFP Book 3, Section 7	Are utility relocation costs to be included in the price proposal?	No. As noted in Section 7.1 for move in state (MIS) work, if additional utility work is added as extra work under the Contract, the Department will address that work through a change order to increase the Contract Amount.
2	RFP Book 3, Section 3.8	Section 3.8 of RFP Book 3 requires full-depth reconstruction of the asphalt pavement at any location where the Design-Builder vertically or horizontally realigns, adjusts, or removes a portion of the roadway cross section. Due to the scope and nature of both project sites, this requirement will result in all pavement within the construction limits to be full-depth reconstructed, no matter the condition. Is this the intent of this requirement?	Full-depth reconstruction is required at all locations where the Design-Builder's Design Documents require new pavement (other than limited transitions at beginning and end of the project necessary to tie into the existing pavement).
3	RFP Book 3, Section 3.5.2	Can TDOT video inspect the existing drainage systems and provide existing drainage repair/replacement requirements to the DB teams pre-bid? Otherwise, DB teams are to assume all pipes are to be replaced. It is unrealistic for all teams to video inspect the drainage system pre-bid.	The Department performed an inspection of the existing 8-foot by 5-foot box culvert and 60-inch oval pipe beneath I-24 westbound (PIN 130900.00), noting both to be structurally and hydraulically sufficient in the existing condition. Videos and photos are included in the Reference Materials and available upon request.
4	RFP Book 1, Section 1.3	The Procurement Schedule/Submittal Deadlines matrix includes "Organizational or Key Personnel changes and SOQ Conflicts of Interests Update" is to be submitted by February 5, 2026. With this procurement being a single step process without a Statement of Qualifications and shortlist, these items need to be deleted from the list of submittals.	See revisions to Section 1.3 in Addendum No. 1, which removes this reference.
5	Book 3, Section 3.2	For PIN 130902.00, this section states that "All driveways and intersection connections to Shellmound Road shall meet minimum intersection sight distance requirements". Does this also apply to PIN 130900.00?	Under the Base Technical Concept, no work on Shellmound Road is proposed for PIN 130900.00. However, see revisions to Section 3.2 in Addendum No. 1 that adds this requirement for PIN 130900.00, if needed based on the Design-Builder's Design Documents.
6	Book 3, Section 3.5.1 and Base Technical Concept (PIN 130900.00)	The Base Technical Concept (Sheet 5C and the Bridge Layout) indicates the placement of a ditch to approximately EL 623 beneath the bridge but no work is shown along Shellmound Road to outfall that flow to meet the design requirements. Please extend the turn-in date to allow the teams to account for this in our designs and bids.	The Base Technical Concept is conceptual by definition. Please refer to Section 3.5.1 of Book 3, which notes that through the Design-Builder's design development process, "the Design-Builder shall design culvert and pipe outfalls, channels, and ditches (including special ditches) within the Project Limits in accordance with requirements of the TDOT Drainage Manual."
7	Book 3, Section 3.2 and Base Technical Concept (PIN 130900.00)	The Base Technical Concept Bridge Layout indicates shoulder widening along Shellmound Road but this widening is not shown in the Roadway drawings. What are the required limits of this widening along Shellmound Road? Please extend the turn-in date to allow the teams to account for this in our designs and bids.	The Base Technical Concept is conceptual by definition. The shoulder widening shown on the 130900.00 Base Technical Concept bridge layout is noted as "FUTURE" and would not be constructed as a part of this Project. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the Design-Builder to develop a design that meets the requirements of the Contract Documents.
8	Book 3, Section 9.5.4	Are the improvements to the Connector Road intersections limited to signing and striping or are radius improvements required? If so, what is the design vehicle?	Radius improvements are not required. See the scope for the Connector Road improvements as detailed in Section 9.5.4 in Book 3.
9	Environmental Documents	The ETSA provided does not include the area required for the Connector Road improvements. Will the Department complete the required documentation to add this area to the ETSA?	The work related to the Connector Road is included in the respective NEPA Document and is therefore cleared for this Project. If the Design-Builder's Design Documents significantly modify the general scope for the Connector Road improvements (beyond what is detailed in Section 9.5.4 in Book 3), the Design-Builder shall be responsible for any added time or cost to reevaluate the NEPA Document in accordance with Section 8 in Book 3.

**Form QR**  
**RFP Question Request**

**Project & DB Contract: Shellmound Bridge Bundle (DB2503)**

Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	TDOT Response
10	Book 1, Section 1.3	Proposer's final deadline for submittal of Form QR, requests for QPL determination, organizational or Key Personnel changes, SOQ conflicts of interests update, and/or alternate technical concepts (ATCs). We have not submitted personnel information. Can the Department clarify what "personnel changes" refers to?	See response to question #4.
11	Book 2, Section 3.4	Can the Department confirm that Level 1 Personnel can also serve in a Level 2 Personnel role as long as all qualifications are met?	This is at the Proposer's discretion in order to adequately staff the Project, and the DBRC will review this as part of its determination of a Proposal's technical acceptability.
12	Reference Documents	Are Roadway Plans for I-24 available?	See the plans added to the Reference Documents provided on the Project website.
13	Book 3, Section 3.5	What are the limits of the Project? Is it just the disturbed area at each bridge and approaches or does it include everything in between including the detour	The general Project limits are defined in Section 1.1 of Book 3 for both PINs, inclusive of any disturbed areas at each bridge location and approaches. The limits of the Connector Road improvements are separate and detailed in Section 9.5.4 in Book 3.
14	Book 3, Attachment B	RFP released stating that the Design Vehicle for Shellmound Road is to be a WB-67. 1) The intersection sight distance listed is 200 ft for 30 mph, which meets the Greenbook standard for a passenger car, but not for a WB-67, especially a WB-67 on a steep downgrade coming over a crest curve like Shellmound is going to be on. Thus, the two design criteria are not aligned. 2) There is another design criterion discrepancy on this sheet. Under the General Information Section, the Design Vehicle is listed as a WB-67, however under the Intersections section, the Design Vehicle is listed as a WB-62. 3) By stating the design vehicle is a WB-67 then you are requiring a pavement design to be based on the WB-67 for both Shellmound Road and the Shellmound Road Temporary Detour. Is this the department's intended desire?	1 & 2) The stopping sight distance criteria has been moved under the "General Information" section of Attachment B. The Design-Builder shall provide the required intersection sight distance for all intersecting roadways within the Project Limits on Shellmound Road. See revisions to Attachment B in Addendum No. 1, where the design vehicle was changed under the "Intersections" Section of Attachment B. 3) No. The pavement design shall meet the requirements stated in Section 9.5.4 in Book 3.
15	Reference Material, DB2503 I-24 over Shellmound BTC-Roadway.pdf, Proposed Layout	The Base Technical Concept depicts a box culvert extension with a horizontal bend. Given TDOT's historical maintenance considerations associated with bends in culverts, as well as the potential right-of-way impacts that may result from straightening the channel, does TDOT intend this configuration to represent a preferred solution? Alternatively, would TDOT consider other culvert layouts acceptable, provided they satisfy hydraulic performance requirements while appropriately balancing long-term maintenance considerations and right-of-way impacts?	1) No. The Base Technical Concept is conceptual by definition. 2) Yes, as long as the solution is consistent with the TDOT standards and Book 3 requirements, including a) Section 6 requirements for obtaining additional right-of-way based on the Design-Builder's design changes (if needed) and b) Section 3.5.1 in Book 3 that states, "the Design-Builder shall design culvert and pipe outfalls, channels, and ditches (including special ditches) within the Project Limits in accordance with requirements of the TDOT Drainage Manual."
16	RFP Book 1, Section 3.4.1 Key Personnel Resumes	The RFP identifies a Design Lead Engineer – Geotechnical as Level "2" Personnel to be included in the Technical Proposal. Based on the geotechnical information made available within the Project reference materials and the Proposer's anticipated foundation design approach, the Proposer may determine that additional geotechnical design services are not required. Under these circumstances, would the absence of a Design Lead Engineer – Geotechnical be considered a deficiency or otherwise negatively impact the Technical Proposal evaluation or scoring?	A Proposer not including a Design Lead - Geotechnical, as required in the RFP, would be considered unresponsive. The geotechnical data report provided in the Reference Documents is not a complete engineering report sealed by an engineer. It provides information the Proposer may elect to use when developing its Proposal. Per Section 5 of Book 3, "the Design-Builder shall perform a design-level geotechnical investigation and engineering to validate and augment the geotechnical information included in the Reference Documents. The Design-Builder shall perform all geotechnical subsurface investigations and laboratory testing in accordance with the current TDOT Geotechnical Guidelines."

**Form QR**  
**RFP Question Request**

**Project & DB Contract: Shellmound Bridge Bundle (DB2503)**

Number	RFP Book No. and Section ID	Question	TDOT Response
17	Book 3, Table 4	Considering the limited TCEs and a drainage easement needed for the Base Technical Concept, if the design-builder cannot design out these needs, is the full 20-month ROW acquisition timeline necessary?	The full ROW timeline is not necessary. See revisions to Table 4 in Addendum No.1, which reduces the required ROW timeline to account for the limited ROW needs under Base Technical Concept.
18	Book 1, Section 4.2.1.2	Has Department reconsidered increasing the per day "cost" for the B portion based on an open question from the previous QR process?	Yes. See revisions to Section 4.2.1.2 of Book 1 in Addendum No. 1.