

Question and Answer Matrix (Q&A Matrix)

North Houston Highway Improvement Project (NHHIP) 3C-2 Project
Request for Qualifications (RFQ)
September 18, 2026



TxDOT Question Number	Document	Reference	Sub Reference	Question	TxDOT Response
1	RFQ	Section 3	3.1, Procurement Process	<i>"The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) will evaluate the Qualifications Statement (QSs) it receives in response to this Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and intends to establish, according to criteria generally outlined herein, a shortlist of two or more Proposers that are eligible to receive the Request for Proposals (RFP)."</i> Is there any limitation of maximum number of shortlisted proposers?	In accordance with 23 Code of Federal Regulations § 636.207, the maximum number of firms to be shortlisted will not exceed five, unless TxDOT determines based on the QSs received that it is in TxDOT's interest to have a number greater than five.
2	RFQ	Section 4	4.2, Format	RE Font: Section 4.2(c) states that Volume 1 must be presented in Arial 12-point font. Several of the forms provided in the RFQ package use Verdana Font. Please confirm whether Proposers should: (a) complete the provided forms in their existing format, or (b) convert all form content to Arial 12-point font.	Section 4.2(c) of the RFQ has been revised in Addendum Number (No.) 1 to require Proposers to submit Volume 1 of their QSs, including the required forms, in Verdana 12-point font.
3	RFQ	Section 4	4.2, Format	Section 4.2(c) requires Volume 1 to be presented in Arial 12-point font, including diagrams, organizational charts, and other graphics. To facilitate the effective presentation of legible visual information, will TxDOT permit the use of Arial 10-point or 11-point font strictly for graphics, diagrams, organizational charts, tables, figures, and similar visual content, provided that all narrative body text remains in Arial 12-point font and the smaller text remains clearly legible?	Section 4.2(c) of the RFQ has been revised in Addendum #1 to require Proposers to submit Volume 1 of their QSs in Verdana 12-point font and to allow Proposers to submit diagrams, organizational charts and graphics, other than tables, in Verdana, 10-point font.
4	RFQ	Section 4	4.2, Format	<i>RFQ Section 4.2.b and Exhibit A Section 2 both state "forms shall not be modified other than to include requested information."</i> Exhibit A, Table 1 states Form G-2 Key Personnel Resume is limited to five pages per person. However, the form provided by TxDOT to be used is seven pages. Please allow respondents to modify forms as needed to adhere to the page limits.	The page limitation for Form G-2 has been revised to 7 pages in Addendum No. 1 to the RFQ.
5	RFQ	Section 5	5.3.2(b), Statement of Technical Approach	<i>"(b) The extent to which the Statement of Technical Approach demonstrates a complete understanding of Project risks and potential solutions, regardless of ownership of such risks, that may arise during all Project phases (15 points)"</i> TxDOT is asking for potential solutions, i) How will TxDOT keep these potential solutions in this preliminary stage Confidential? ii) With the understanding that these potential solutions are conceptual during RFQ stage and if it is found that these potential solutions are not deemed feasible, during RFP stage, do we retain the flexibility to change them without getting negatively scored in the RFP.	i) As set forth in Section 6.2 of the RFQ, the content of QSs are subject to the Public Information Act, codified in Texas Government Code Chapter 552 and related Rules. ii) Yes, Proposers retain the flexibility to change and refine their potential technical solutions from submission of their QSs to submission of their Proposals without negatively affecting their Proposal scores.
6	RFQ	Section 6	6.1, Improper Communications and Contacts	Can person's working in these agencies be contacted and used as reference on Form I?	Yes, the entities listed in Section 6.1(d) may be identified as references on Form I if such persons are not listed as excluded references in Table 2 of Exhibit B to the RFQ.
7	RFQ	Section 6	6.4, Potential Conflicts of Interest	The RFQ states the following: The Design-Build (DB) Contractor shall be required as part of the construction quality management plan (CQMP) to include a process in accordance with Attachment 4-2 of the Programmatic DB General Conditions available at TxDOT.gov, and Section 3.2.2.2 of TxDOT's Quality Assurance Program (QAP) for Design- Build Projects, October 2020, available at TxDOT.gov. TxDOT has updated the TxDOT Quality Assurance Program for CDA/Design Build Projects in 2026. Will TxDOT be using the updated version?	The reference to the QAP in Section 6.4 of the RFQ has been revised in Addendum No. 1 to the RFQ to refer to the 2026 version of the QAP.

Question and Answer Matrix (Q&A Matrix)

North Houston Highway Improvement Project (NHHIP) 3C-2 Project
Request for Qualifications (RFQ)
September 18, 2026



TxDOT Question Number	Document	Reference	Sub Reference	Question	TxDOT Response
8	RFQ	Exhibit C, Volume 2	Section A, Financial Statements	A Guarantor of DB Contractors' obligations under the Design-Build Contract (DBC) is required under certain circumstances. In referencing the Design-Build Agreement (DBA) Programmatic Version 8.1, Page 23, Section 5.2 Guaranty, clause 5.2.3 The Minimum Tangible Net Worth Requirement for this DBC is not provided. Please provide the Minimum Tangible Net Worth Requirement in Proposers' assessment in determining its Guarantor necessity in its response to the RFQ.	TxDOT will not dictate a minimum Tangible Net Worth amount. The Tangible Net Worth shall be calculated as 90% of the total combined Tangible Net Worth of the DB Contractor, its joint venture members (if DB Contractor is a joint venture), its partners (if DB Contractor is a partnership), and any Guarantors. Tangible Net Worth for each such entity shall be determined based on the most recent audited financial statements included with the Proposal, or to the extent included in the Proposal, any more recent quarterly financial statements.
9	RFQ	Exhibit C, Volume 2	Section A, Financial Statements	Please clarify submittal format and/or details for Proposer to submit DB Contractor request for TxDOT review of existing financials for TxDOT's determination as to the applicability of the previously submitted financial statements "submitted to TxDOT's Construction Division as part of the requalification process in lieu of including such financial statements in the QS."	The process for utilizing previously submitted financial statements is set forth in Section A of Volume 2 of Exhibit C to the RFQ. The Proposer's request, including the required information, should be included in Section A of Volume 2 of the QS.
10	RFQ	Exhibit D	Section 1	The Project Description/ Information states that this project includes the construction of utility bridges, but does not provide further information on which utility owners will occupy the utility bridges. Is TxDOT working on an Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the affected utility owners that are proposed to occupy the newly constructed utility bridges?	Relocation of utilities from existing utility bridges to newly constructed utility bridges or to other locations, is a determination to be made between the affected utility owners and the DB Contractor. Refer to the utility strip maps and the Utility Conflict Matrix (UCM) in the Reference Information Documents (RIDs) for details on utilities on the existing utility bridges.
11	RFQ	Exhibit D	Section 7(b)	There are 3 CenterPoint (CNP) Energy Transmission crossings listed as conflicts in the UCM, which typically take 24 months to relocate after receipt of a Notice of Required Accommodation (NORA). We understand that TxDOT is currently working on an agreement with CNP Entergy which is planned to be executed by June 2027- can you confirm that the agreement with CNP Energy will address all 3 crossings and that the design will be made available to the proposers by or around June 2027?	CenterPoint Transmission crossings at Commerce Street (St.), and Mckee St./ Hardee St. (utility identifications (IDs) E93 and E94) are not in conflict with the proposed ultimate scope for North Houston Highway Improvement Project (NHHIP) Segment 3C-2. TxDOT anticipates entering into an advanced utility relocation agreement with CenterPoint Transmission for utility ID E92, the crossing over I-10 adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) bridge at Houston Subdivision-2 (Saint Arnolds brewery), and that the line will be relocated in accordance with the advance utility agreement. TxDOT will provide more information about the schedule of this relocation in the RFP.
12	RFQ	Exhibit D	Section 7(b)	The right of way (ROW) taking for this project will require the disconnection of electric and gas service to numerous private residences in the Kelly Village Apartments subdivision. Disconnections can only be requested by the property owner- can you confirm that these disconnections will be addressed at the time of ROW acquisition or if the DB proposer will be responsible for coordinating that effort through TxDOT's ROW group?	TxDOT will acquire the Schematic ROW for the 3C-2 Project. Utility disconnections in the Kelly Village Apartments subdivision will be addressed at the time of ROW acquisition by TxDOT.

Question and Answer Matrix (Q&A Matrix)

North Houston Highway Improvement Project (NHHIP) 3C-2 Project
Request for Qualifications (RFQ)
September 18, 2026



TxDOT Question Number	Document	Reference	Sub Reference	Question	TxDOT Response
13	RFQ	Exhibit D	Section 7, Geotechnical Investigations, Utility Investigations, Hazardous Materials Investigations, Railroad Coordination and Third Party Coordination	"During the procurement, shortlisted Proposers will be given the opportunity to identify additional boring locations for testing by TxDOT's consultants. In addition, shortlisted Proposers will be allowed to conduct non-destructive geotechnical investigation activities on TxDOT ROW or available private property (pursuant to a right of entry granted to TxDOT). Such activities will require the appropriate coordination with TxDOT as specified by TxDOT during the procurement process (i.e., permitting, traffic control, notification etc.). Proposers must obtain permits through the normal permitting process prior to performing any drilling on State ROW." Upon requesting these additional borings, will TxDOT conduct the additional Borings requested by the Proposers or will it be the Proposer's responsibility. Please clarify whether a Bore hole is considered a non-destructive Test?	TxDOT may conduct testing on additional boring locations identified by Proposers, on a case by case basis, after evaluating Proposers' requests. Bore hole investigation is considered to be a destructive form of geotechnical investigation.
14	RFQ	Forms	D-1, Technical Experience - Design	Is the Lead Designer allowed to include projects in which the design has been 100% completed, but the construction is ongoing?	Yes.
15	RFQ	Forms	F, Safety Qualifications	Form F identifies reporting years 2022, 2023, and 2024 as required for proposer responses on Table 1. Fatal injury rate (FIR) per 100,000 Full-Time Workers, and Table 2. Incidence rate (IR) of Injury and Illness Cases per 100 Full-Time Workers. Table 3. National Council on Compensation Insurance (NCCI) Experience Modifiers does not note specific reporting years in the table but the Table 3 footnote indicates that "Proposer should include data for the three most recent years for which annual data is available, but should not include any data from years earlier than four years prior to the date of the RFQ." Please confirm that only Table 3 requires data for the three most recent years for which annual data is available, but Tables 1 and 2 require data specifically for 2022, 2023, and 2024.	Confirmed, Table 3 requires data for the three most recent years for which annual data is available, and Tables 1 and 2 require data specifically for 2022, 2023, and 2024.
16	RFQ	Forms	G-2, Key Personnel Resume and References	On page 47, Table 1 says Form G-2 is limited to 5 pages per person, however the actual Form G-2 template spans 7 pages without any content. Please advise how many pages we are limited to per person.	The page limitation for Form G-2 has been revised to 7 pages in Addendum No. 1 to the RFQ.
17	RFQ	Forms	G-2, Key Personnel Resume and References	Exhibit A, Table 1 limits Form G-2 to "5 pages per person" (excluding licenses, license applications, and commitment statements). However, the provided Form G-2 is seven pages. Section 4.2(b) further states that "Forms shall not be modified other than to include requested information." Please clarify how Proposers should complete and submit the required, unmodified Form G-2 within the five-page limit.	The page limitation for Form G-2 has been revised to 7 pages in Addendum No. 1 to the RFQ.
18	RFQ	Forms	G-2, Key Personnel Resume and References	The Form G-2 template provided in the word file is 7 pages long which exceeds the maximum number of pages allowed per Table 1. Please revise and release a template for compliant submittal.	The page limitation for Form G-2 has been revised to 7 pages in Addendum No. 1 to the RFQ.
19	RID	Schematics/Design		Could the department share with the proposers open-roads/bridge files or Geopak for the project if available?	Design files will be provided in OpenRoads Designer/OpenBridge Modeler format.
20	RID	Schematics/Design		Please provide a List of Design Exceptions available beyond those included in the Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR). (It is included in the Index but not in the TxDOT's website)	There are no Design Exceptions requiring review and approval of TxDOT Design Division and FHWA for the NHHIP 3C-2 Schematic Design within the NHHIP 3C-2 Schematic ROW.
21	RFQ		Workshop - Presentation/ Summary	TxDOT mentioned that it has confirmed with Xylem that they can accommodate the procurement request to support Buy America for the Pump Station. Has TxDOT confirmed that they can produce the 10 required pumps in time to meet the project schedule?	At this time, TxDOT has not discussed the manufacturing timeline of the pumps with Xylem. TxDOT is performing additional due diligence and will be prepared for those discussions during the RFP.

Question and Answer Matrix (Q&A Matrix)

North Houston Highway Improvement Project (NHHIP) 3C-2 Project
Request for Qualifications (RFQ)
September 18, 2026



TxDOT Question Number	Document	Reference	Sub Reference	Question	TxDOT Response
22	RFQ		Workshop - Presentation/ Summary (Utilities)	<i>Industry Workshop — Other Due Diligence: SUE investigations; RIDs Schedule — Final Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE)</i> Please identify the percentage of utility facilities for which Quality Level A SUE is expected to be completed by issuance of the Final RFP, and identify any facilities or locations that will not have Quality Level A information.	All quality Level A SUE performed by TxDOT to date is provided in the RIDs. TxDOT is not anticipating performing any additional QL-A SUE at this time. If requested by Proposers, TxDOT may perform additional QL-A SUE on a case-by-case basis. The UCM will be updated to reflect the level of SUE provided for each utility.
23	RFQ		Workshop - Presentation/ Summary (Utilities)	<i>Industry Workshop — Project Overview: "Reconstruct...one pedestrian, and three utility bridges"</i> For each proposed utility bridge, please provide the required location, configuration, design life, loading and deflection criteria, clearance envelope, expansion capacity, utility-specific separation requirements, access provisions, and the design standards and approval authorities that Proposers must use.	Design and construction of utility and pedestrian bridges must comply with the requirements of the DBC, including DB Specifications Item 13 Third Party Agreements, Item 14 Utilities, and Item 21 Structures.
24	RFQ		Workshop - Presentation/ Summary (Utilities)	<i>Industry Workshop — Project Overview: "Reconstruct...one pedestrian, and three utility bridges"</i> Please identify the required construction sequence, temporary support or bypass facilities, outage restrictions, access constraints, tie-in requirements, and schedule milestones for transferring utilities to each utility bridge, including responsibility.	The relocation of utilities from existing utility bridges to reconstructed utility bridges, or to other locations, including any coordination with utility owners, will be DB Contractor's responsibility and must be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the DBC, including DB Specification Item 14 Utilities.