

# COUNTY OF EL DORADO

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



**TAHOE ENGINEERING**  
 924B Emerald Bay Road  
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150  
 Phone: (530) 573-7900  
 Fax: (530) 541-7049

**RICHARD W. SHEPARD, P.E.**  
 Director of Transportation  
 Internet Web Site:  
<http://co.el-dorado.ca.us/dot>

**MAIN OFFICE**  
 2850 Fairlane Court  
 Placerville CA 95667  
 Phone: (530) 621-5900  
 Fax: (530) 626-0387



**DATE:** October 15, 2008

**TO:** All Prospective Bidders

**SUBJECT:** Responses to Bidders' Inquiries No. 2  
 El Dorado Trail Improvement Project, Forni Road to Missouri Flat Road  
 (Bid No. GS 08-1021)

Bid Inquiry No. 2 contains responses to questions posed for the above referenced project.

ITEM NO.	PAGE OR DRAWING NO.	INQUIRY/RESPONSE
2.01	Plan Sheets S1-S8	<b>Question: Is the design shown on the Structural Sheets adequate to build without submitting design calculations?</b> <b>Answer: See Addendum No. 1</b>
2.02	Plan Sheets S1-S8	<b>Question: Everything for the bridges seems to be pretty much called out and I would assume that the sizes of timber are for dimension lumber (no glu-lams called out).</b> <b>Answer: See Addendum No. 1</b>
2.03		<b>Question: Could acceptable Alternate design suppliers be mentioned realizing that there may be more than you know about?</b> <b>Answer: Contractor is responsible for finding suppliers. No supplier has been barred from bidding.</b>
2.04	Plan Sheet S8	<b>Question: The Culvert Bridge approach rail shown on Sheet S8 is different.</b> <b>Answer: The rail section is to be the same as on the bridge. The posts shall be anchored in concrete and do not have the 4"x4" picket.</b>
2.05		<b>Question: Will you require any calculations from the glulam supplier?</b> <b>Answer: See addendum #1.</b>
2.06	SP-10	<b>Question: Does this project require a 5 year warranty instead of the usual one year?</b> <b>Answer: Section 5-1.02 – As stated in the specifications.</b>
2.07	Plan Sheets C3, C17,	<b>Question: The timber railing along the paths and on the retaining walls is not detailed. It appears to be somewhat different than the bridge rail.</b> <b>Answer: The timber rail section is to be the same as on the bridge with the addition of an ADA handrail. The posts shall be anchored in concrete.</b>
2.08	Plan Sheet S8	<b>Question: What is the height of the rail?</b> <b>Answer: As stated on Sheet S8, Elevation</b>
2.09		<b>Confirmation:</b> Longhrut Road has been identified as a "Private Road." Should the Contractor choose to use this road in the transport of workers, materials and supplies it will remain the responsibility of the Contractor to secure the necessary authorization for use of the same. Any claims of damage associated with the use of this road, by the Contractor, shall be the sole responsibility of the Contractor.

2.10	Bid Inquiry No. 1	<b>Bid Inquiry 1.09</b> As noted on Plan Sheet C1 below EXCAVATION SUMMARY table. (See also Addendum No. 2)
2.11	SP-61 Plan Sheets C4-C15	<b>Question: Can you please clarify what the Erosion Control type D square yardage is and where it is located. I can't seem to find it on the plans and it seems unclear in the special provisions. If you could please clarify it would be greatly appreciated.</b> <b>Answer:</b> Section 10-1.16 – As stated in the specifications. Plan sheets C4-C15 – “Grading Limit” as noted on the plan sheets.
2.12	SP-61	<b>Question: Per spec section 10-1.15, page SP-61 Earthwork, the specials state the “New bike path areas that have at least 6 inches of existing ballast material that will remain based on the proposed grades shall be uniformly moisture-conditioned at or near optimum moisture content and compacted to 95%... In the upper 6 inches .” If this statement was taken at face value, all we would have to do is moisture condition the ballast and recompact, but that is best case assuming the ballast has enough fines to achieve compaction and the subgrade (grading plane) is already at 95%. Most likely the ballast will be out of fines and the material will need to be processed to achieve the 95% compaction as required. Please indicate if it is the County’s intent to cut rock finish grade (where areas already have 6 inches) moisture condition and recompact or remove the material 6 inches recompact subgrade (grading plane) and replace the material back after processing the ballast and placing it back to rock finish grade.</b> <b>Answer:</b> See Addendum No. 1, See Bid Inquiry No. 1
<b>The bid due date remains October 20, 2008 at 2:00 p.m.</b>		

Holders who have already mailed their proposal can contact Jordan Postlewait at (530) 621-55330 (email: jordan.postlewait@edcgov.us) to arrange for the return of their proposal.

Inform all suppliers and subcontractors as necessary.

The General Services Department is sending these responses to bidders' inquiries by fax to all document holders. These responses to bidders' inquiries will also be available at the following website: <http://www.co.el-dorado.ca.us/DOT/bids.html>

**Responses to bidder inquiries, unless incorporated into formal addenda to the contract, are not a part of the contract, and are provided for the bidder's convenience only. In some instances, the question and answer may represent a summary of the matters discussed rather than a word-for-word recitation. The availability or use of information provided in the responses to bidder inquiries is not to be construed in any way as a waiver of the provisions of Section 2-1.03, “Examination of Plans, Specifications, Contract, and Site of Work,” of the Standard Specifications or any other provision of the contract, the plans, Standard Specifications, or special provisions, nor to excuse the contractor from full compliance with those contract requirements. Bidders are cautioned that subsequent responses or contract addenda may affect or vary a response previously given.**

Sincerely,  
  
 Jordan Postlewait  
 Manager of Parks and Grounds

Cc: Janel Gifford, DOT  
 John Kahling, DOT