JOB 040904
CLEAR CREEK RD. – I-40 (PHASE 1) (F)
NOVEMBER 4, 2026

Question:
Please verify the Compacted Embankment Quantity for Ramp I49NB-I40WB Stage 4 listed in Earthwork Table on Plan Sheet 202. No quantity is listed on the table, but the cross-section data on plan sheets 642-644 indicates a substantial quantity of embankment required.

Answer:
That is correct. There should have been 27346 Cu. Yds. of Compacted Embankment quantity for Ramp I49NB-I40WB Stage 4. This will be addressed via addendum.

Question:
The earthwork quantity box has a note that indicates the project will be plan quantity. Is that the intent for the project? Earthwork quantities for a project of this magnitude should be based on cross sectioned areas of work completed not plan quantity.

Answer:
The note is removed and addressed via addendum no.2.

Question:
Does the Addendum 2 restriction on "earth-disturbing activities" also prohibit non-disturbing use of the area, such as trucking/hauling operations or equipment travel passing through or staging within those station limits?

Answer:
For the purpose of avoiding earth-disturbing activities, any heavy equipment or hauling operations passing through or staging in these areas should be avoided.

Question:
Should bidders plan around no access to the Addendum 2 area until 12/31/2027, or is earlier release reasonably anticipated?

Answer:
The archeological mitigation may be completed earlier than anticipated depending on many factors, such as weather, holidays, etc. Notification will be sent once work is complete in each area. The plan is to start the archeological mitigation between Stations 620+00 to 629+00 first, since it is in the location where the bridge will be built over Frog Bayou.

Question:
This contract includes an A+C provision, with the "C" portion based on Contractor-proposed completion days at $35,000/day (liquidated damages for late completion, incentive for early completion up to 125 days). If a time extension is granted under the Addendum 2 delay provision, will the Contractor's bid days - and corresponding incentive/LD thresholds - be adjusted accordingly? Or does the extension only protect against liquidated damage while the original bid-day baseline for incentive purposes remains fixed? Please also clarify whether the provision's "no claim for extra compensation" language is intended to bar any adjustment to incentive eligibility caused by this delay.

Answer:
Project has Prosecution and Progress with Bid Schedule SP, so a CPM schedule is required on the project. The availability date of the sections indicated in the “Construction Delay due to Archeological Mitigation” SP should be included in the contractor’s schedule accordingly. If delays beyond 12-31-27 occur, then a Time Impact Analysis may be submitted to show the effect of the delay on the critical path. Overall contract time extensions will be added if an impact to the critical path results in movement of the completion date (which would apply for both liquidated damages and incentives/disincentives). Accordingly, if any of the sections affected by SP are released early, the resulting time savings to the critical path will be considered as Float.

Question:
Is the omission of TIP testing for these shafts intentional? If TIP testing is required, could you provide the exact quantity of shafts requiring this test, along with their respective lengths and diameters?

Answer:
There is no TIP testing for the shafts on this project.

Question:
The Percent Within Limits/Pavement Smoothness (IRI) special provision allows for exemption from the IRI specification on ramps (Subsection 410.09(b)(2)(b)), whereas the concrete specification has no such exemption for ramps. It is difficult for concrete pavement to achieve the desired IRI on the more cut-up sections like ramps, similar to asphalt.

Answer:
The PCC Pavement Smoothness (IRI) SP will be revised to exempt ramps from IRI acceptance and price-adjustment requirements. Ramps will remain subject to the applicable localized roughness criteria and surface tolerance requirements.

Question:
Will ARDOT confirm the intended method of measurement and basis of payment for the applicable earthwork items, including whether quantities may be measured in place where actual field conditions differ from plan quantities?

Answer:
Addendum 2 removed the earthwork plan quantity note from the Earthwork box in the Quantities. Method of measurements will follow the ARDOT Standard Specifications as well as any applicable SPs included in the contract.

Question:
Will ARDOT clarify whether tree clearing may be performed during the 90-day flexible beginning period, prior to commencement of contract time, while prohibiting grubbing, excavation, embankment, and other earth-disturbing work until the official project starts?

Answer:
Special Clearing would initiate contract time charges during the flexible beginning of work period. Tree removal may require lane closures depending on traffic impacts. However, the Special Clearing Special Provision will be removed via addendum.

Question:
The double RCP located at Waterfront Sta. 20+70 is identified as 30" RCP in the Plan & Profile and Cross Sections. It is also identified as 30" RCP in the Quantity Box Description. However, the quantity is under the column for 36" under Pipe Culvert Alternates. This quantity is also on the bid form under Pipe Culvert Alternates as 36" Pipe. Please specify which pipe size is correct.

Answer:
The 30" pipe size is correct. The quantities will be updated via addendum to reflect the 30" sizes as noted in the plan sheet.

Question:
While reviewing the concrete ditch paving, we found inconsistencies between the quantity table and the individual P&P sheets. Please review and confirm which is correct for each item below.

Answer:

#	Station Range	Quantity Table	P&P Sheet	Delta	Answer
a	597+00.00 to 598+76.28	117.33 SY	Sheet 241: 117.53 SY	+0.20 SY	Quantity table should match 117.53 SY
b	702+70.00 to 704+25.56	105.33 SY	Sheet 245: 120.00 SY	+14.67 SY	Quantity table and P&P sheet should be 103.71 SY (using Sta. to Sta. method)
c	702+70.00 to 704+25.56 (stationing)	As noted	Sheet 245: 702+[70].00 to 704+50.00	+24.44 LF	The 704+25.56 station is correct.
d	832+42.00 to 834+00.00 (stationing)	As noted	Sheet 251: 832+22.00 to 834+00.00	+20.00 LF	Item should be 833+72 to 834+00 in quantity table, P&P sheet, and drawn into plan view. Line item should be 85.33 SY.
e	21+00.00 to 22+77.06	0.00 SY (not listed)	Sheet 289: 118.04 SY	+118.04 SY	Add line item 21+00.00 to 22+77.06 to concrete ditch quantity sheet
f	30+75.00 to 32+00.00	83.33 SY	Sheet 294: 55.56 SY	-27.77 SY	P&P sheet should match 83.33 SY.

Question:
While reviewing the Box culverts, we found inconsistencies between the quantity sheet and quantity indicated by the Special Detail Sheet. Please review and confirm which is correct for each item below.

Answer:

#	Station/Location	Quantity Sheet	Plans / Special Detail Sheets	Answer
a	Sta. 600+76.74 C.L. of I-49, Quadruple 8' x 5' R.C. Box Culvert	6,845.88 CY Class S Concrete – Roadway	Special Detail Sheets indicate less than half the quantity	Quantity will be revised to 3252.18 CY.
b	Sta. 631+45, 4' × 3' R.C. Box	Plan Sheets and cross sections show Double 4' × 3' × 504' R.C. Box	Plan view, CAD linework, and Special Detail Sheet show a single barrel	This is a single-barrel box. Plan note and quantity description will be revised accordingly.
c	Sta. 10+34 C.L. Henry SR, Single 4' × 2' R.C. Box	1,947 CY Unclassified Excavation for Structures – Roadway	Contractor's takeoff indicates substantially less	Quantity should be revised to 88 CY.

Question:
While reviewing the storm pipe quantities, we found inconsistencies between the quantity sheets, plan sheets, and cross-section sheets regarding pipe lengths, sizes, and configurations. Please review and confirm which is correct for each item below.

Answer:

#	Station / Location	Quantity Sheet	Plan / Cross-Section Sheets	Answer
a	Sta. 612+19 C.L. ML I-40	66 LF extension of 24" R.C. Pipe	In-place 24" × 66' R.C. pipe with FES LT removed, pipe retained and extended 38' LT	Quantity should be 38 LF for the pipe extension.
b	Sta. 20+70 C.L. Waterfront	36" R.C. Pipe and Alternate Pipe	30" R.C. Pipe	Quantity sheet should reflect 30" pipe in plan and cross sections.
c	Sta. 41+25 C.L. Driveway 7	Double 24" Side Drain	Plan view shows a single 24" side drain; cross section does not indicate double	Quantity sheet should reflect a single 24" side drain.

Question:
The bid quantity of 26,932 CY covers only 242,388 SY at 4" thick. It appears this quantity is sufficient for top-soil plating of the subgrade not being paved (as shown on the typical sections), but not for all slopes. Additionally, the Compacted Embankment Zoning special provision defines the top 24-inch of the embankment side slopes and median area as the Unpaved Exterior Zone, which must meet additional sieve and plasticity requirements. Is it feasible for the stripped topsoil to meet these requirements? If not, is this why the quantity appears to be sufficient only for the 4-inch top-soil plating shown in the typical sections?

Answer:
The 24-inch Unpaved Exterior Zone is part of the compacted embankment and must meet the applicable material and compaction requirements. Stripped topsoil is not intended to be used to satisfy these requirements. The Removing and Replacing Topsoil special provision addresses the salvage, stockpiling, and replacement of topsoil on finished surfaces. Topsoil is placed over the completed Unpaved Exterior Zone, not as part of the required 24-inch thickness.

Question:
How are Unpaved Exterior Zone and top-soil material to be measured and paid for?

Answer:
Material placed within the Unpaved Exterior Zone is measured and paid for under Compacted Embankment, the same as material placed in the other compacted embankment zones. Removing and Replacing Topsoil is measured and paid for by the cubic yard measured in the stockpile. The unit price includes removal, stockpiling, hauling, and replacement of the topsoil.

Question:
During the site visit, it appeared that nearly all of the buildings had already been demolished, with only the associated slabs and driveways remaining. Please clarify whether the applicable removal line items will still be paid for at the bid quantities and unit prices, or if payment will be adjusted to reflect only the remaining work.

Answer:
No demolition of buildings will be needed; however, the associated slabs will still need to be removed. The plans will be revised reflecting the remaining work. This will be addressed via addendum.

Question:
The Special Flood Hazard Areas special provision, as revised in Addendum 2, shows temporary work platforms at Bridges 7A and 7B over Frog Bayou. The platforms run parallel to the existing banks and appear intended to facilitate construction of Bents 3 and 4. However, no water crossing is shown that would allow construction access between the south and north banks. Will ARDOT allow a temporary water crossing at this location? If so, what additional constraints or restrictions should the contractor expect in order to comply?

Answer:
The Construction Work Plan (CWP) presented in the Section 408 documentation was a concept to illustrate potential temporary impacts of what the contractor may need to perform the necessary work. The contractor may, at their discretion, deviate from the CWP concept, but they will be required to coordinate any deviations with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The contractor should be aware that significant changes to the CWP may trigger re-opening the 408 process, and that the determination of the change threshold is based solely on USACE discretion.

Question:
Regarding the high mast tower drilled shafts: What is the minimum embedment into rock?

Answer:
There is not a minimum rock socket requirement for the high mast tower foundations. Accordingly, the shafts should be constructed to the minimum lengths/elevations shown on the plans, whichever results in the greater shaft depth. Based on the planned shaft lengths, the shafts are generally anticipated to extend into rock. However, due to subsurface variability, the axial and lateral foundation designs do not rely on a minimum rock socket length. Therefore, no minimum embedment into rock is required, provided the shafts meet the minimum lengths/elevations shown on the plans or extend to the top of rock, whichever is greater.

Question:
The original "Archeological Monitoring" provision (Waterfront St, south of Frog Bayou) states monitoring costs are included in unit prices bid. The Addendum 2 "Construction Delay Due to Archeological Mitigation" provision (stations north of Frog Bayou) is not clear on this point - its Basis of Payment section addresses payment for complying with the restriction itself, but not the cost of archeological investigation/observation performed within those station limits. Please confirm who bears that cost.

Answer:
~~The archeological monitoring for the demolition of the house north of Waterfront St. is the only area requiring monitoring on 040904. I would suggest contacting WSP USA, Inc. for the monitoring since they are doing the archeological work north of Frog Bayou. Their contact is: Marc Wampler, marc.wampler@wsp.com. The construction delay for archeological mitigation is separate, and a consultant (WSP) is doing work in those areas once the ROW purchase is finalized and they can be accessed. Thus, ARDOT is responsible for the mitigation that is already being handled by ARDOT's Consultant Contracts.~~
Revised Answer: The contractor is responsible for the cost of hiring an archeological consultant to perform monitoring north of Waterfront St. For the Construction Delay Due to Archeological Mitigation SP, ARDOT is responsible for the cost of archeological investigations and not the contractor.