

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:

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 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.

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 Surface Smoothness (IRI) Special Provision states that "Ramps, acceleration/deceleration lanes, shoulders, islands, tapers, or other incidentals shall not be considered for price adjustments." However, there is no blanket exemption for ramps. The expectation for ramps is that the concrete meets a maximum of 75 in/mi for the first day's production. After that, the smoothness lots cannot be higher than 85 or corrective work will be required.