

Reply to pre-bid queries for the tender of “Rehabilitation and upgradation of Trimbak - Mokhada - Jawhar - Manor - Palghar section of NH-160A to 2-lane/4-lane with paved shoulder (107.035 km) in the State of Maharashtra on EPC Mode” [Tender ID: 2025_MoRTH_879578_1].

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
1.	General	KMZ/ KML	Please provide the KMZ file for better understanding of the project.	As per RFP
2.	Clause 7.3.2 of Schedule-B	7.3.2 Additional new bridges: (D) ROB	Kindly Provide us the approved drawing of ROB.	GAD approval is under process. GAD submitted for approval is uploaded for guidance of bidders.
3.	Clause 2 of Schedule-C	2. Description of Project Facilities: g) Rest Areas & Parking	Kindly provide us the detailed scope for the development of Rest area & Parking facilities. Additionally, provide us the drawing for the same.	The land identified for rest area and parking facility shall be levelled and filled, as required, along with suitable protection / boundary wall and parking sheds. The area shall be paved and adequate drainage shall be provided. The detailed proposal shall be prepared by the Contractor and works shall be carried out as per standards and manuals to the satisfaction of AE / Authority.
4.	Clause 2 of Schedule-C	2. Description of Project Facilities: b) Roadside Furniture shall be provided as follows:	Kindly provide us the minimum quantity for mentioned clause.	As per RFP
5.	General	Due Date Extension	We are keenly interested in participating in the above-mentioned bid, However, we require additional clarity on certain aspects to ensure a comprehensive and competitive submission. Considering the size and complexity of the project, we respectfully request that the Authority grant an extension of 4 weeks from the date we receive your pre-bid replies from your end for submitting a comprehensive bid.	As per RFP

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
6.	General	KMZ/ KML	Upon reviewing the tender documents, we noticed that the Plan and Profile drawings are not legible and the KMZ file is not uploaded in the documents uploaded. For better understanding of the project and to calculate the quantities we need Plan & Profile and KMZ file. We kindly request to you upload these documents to facilitate our site visit and enable us to submit a competitive bid.	Plan and Profile drawings are uploaded separately.
2.	Clause 7.2.2, Schedule 'B'	Culverts	In Schedule B Only Box Culvert Span arrangement has been proposed but the minimum vertical height not mentioned (Vent Size). Request to clarify the minimum vertical height to be provided in all Box Culvert.	Modified Schedule-B is uploaded separately.
3.	Clause 7.3, Schedule 'B'	GAD	GAD of Major Bridge, Minor Bridges & Culverts have not provided for with Bid Documents. Request to Provide the GAD for these structures.	Indicative GADs are uploaded separately for guidance of bidders.
5.	Clause 7.3.1, (ii) (a) & (b), Schedule 'B'	Repair & Strengthening of Existing Structures	As per Clause 7.3.1, (ii) (a) & (b) of Schedule B, Strengthening & Repair has been proposed for 2 Nos Major Bridges (Ch. 168+865 & Ch. 198+350) and 8 Nos Minor Bridges (Ch. 105+802, 107+752, 112+737, 114+916, 118+312, 123+772, 125+647, 125+862) But in Clause 7.6 (A), Repairs, Retain and strengthening of bridges and structures (i) Major Bridges: NIL (ii) Minor Bridges: NIL Please clarify.	Modified Schedule-B is uploaded separately.
6.	Clause 7.3.2 (a), Schedule 'B'	Length of Major Bridge at Ch. 168+805	As per Clause 7.3.2 (a) Schedule 'B' the length of Major Bridge at Chainage Km 168+805 is 6x15.0=90.0m But As per TCS schedule the length of Major Bridge at Chainage Km 168+805 is 120 (TCS-7). Please clarify the exact length of proposed Major Bridge at Chainage Km 168+805 ?	Modified Schedule-B and Indicative GADs are uploaded separately.

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
7.	Clause 7.1.4 (d), Schedule 'B'	Culverts on Cross Road Junctions	As per Clause 7.1.4 (d) of Schedule 'B' proposed Pipe Culverts is 63 nos. But in table mentioned in Schedule B at (+) Junctions 8 Nos & Y & T Junctions 94 nos, total 102 nos. Please clarify total how many numbers culverts on Cross Road junction, bidder should consider.	Modified Schedule-B is uploaded separately.
8.	Clause 2.10, Schedule 'B'	One Time Improvement on Existing Bypassed/Realigned Sections	One Time Improvement on Existing Bypassed/Realigned Sections proposed from chainage Km 190+205 to 191+555 i.e. Manor City section. Exact Scope of work not mentioned in Schedule B, whether Overlay is required or not. Please clarify exact Scope of work in this section?	Contractor shall carryout maintenance of existing road as per RFP. Further, one-time improvement / strengthening of bypassed / realigned sections, as specified, shall be carried out as per Clause 2.10 of Schedule-B.
9.	Clause 3.1, Schedule 'B'	Major & Minor Junctions	In Schedule B, only chainages of Major & Minor Junctions have been mentioned but the details of Cross road like length, width & type (Bituminous/Non-Bituminous) of the Cross road is not mentioned in Schedule B. Request to provide the Crossroad details of all Major & Minor junctions	As per RFP
11.	General	HTMS/ATMS	Highway Traffic Management System/ Advance Traffic Management System has to be provided or not, it is not mentioned in Schedule 'C' Please clarify, bidder should consider HTMS/ATMS or not?	There is no provision of Highway Traffic Management System/ Advance Traffic Management System in the scope.
13.	General	Geotechnical Report	Kindly furnish detail Geotechnical Report.	Available Geotechnical Investigation Report is enclosed separately for guidance of the bidders.
14.	General	Hydrology Report	Kindly furnish detail Hydrology Report	Available Hydrology Report is enclosed separately for guidance of the bidders.
15.	General	Land Acquisition	Request to provided exact Land Acquisition Status of the project.	As per RFP
16.	General	Forest Clearance	Some part of the project is passing through Reserved	Forest clearance is under process.

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
			Forest. Please clarify the status of Forest Clearance	
18.	Clause 7.3.2 (A), Schedule 'B'	Major Bridge at Km 198.350	<p>Clause 7.3.2 (A), Schedule 'B', Major Bridge has been proposed at Chainage Km 198.350 parallel to Existing Major Bridge.</p> <p>As per Plan & Profile the Ground Levels are above of Finished Road level in this Major Bridge section. There is a mistake in Plan & Profile.</p> <p>Request to provide the correct Plan & Profile.</p>	Modified Schedule-B and modified Plan & Profile drawings are uploaded separately.
19.	General	Existing Chainages & Design Chainages	Request to provide table of relation between Existing Chainages with Design Chainages.	Modified Schedule-A is uploaded separately.
20.	Annexure II, Schedule A	Proposed ROW	<p>As per Annexure II, s. no. (ii) Proposed ROW in Section I- Palghar Dist Border to Jawhar Existing Chainage Km 110.00 to 156.00 is 18m.</p> <p>Section II - Jawhar to Palghar Existing Chainage Km 148.505 to 197.050 is 18m. Existing Chainage Km 197.050 to Km 217.210 is 24m. But in S. No. (iii) there mentioned different chainages different ROW.</p> <p>Request to provide the Proposed ROW corresponding to Design Chainages.</p>	Modified Schedule-A is uploaded separately.
2.	General	Right of Way	In Schedule-A, Annex-I1, Clause 2(ii) *Balance Right of Way," the table indicates a proposed Right of Way of 0 for a length of 5.471 km. The Authority is kindly requested to clarify the same.	Modified Schedule-A is uploaded separately.
3.	2.3 of Schedule B	Improvement of existing road geometrics	Schedule-B, Clause 2.3 contains a table titled "Improvement of the Existing Road Geometrics' with a total length of 8.449 km. The Authority is kindly requested to elaborate on the specific type and scope of improvements to be undertaken, along with the corresponding Typical Cross Section details for each stretch.	As per RFP
4.	General	Utility Shifting Plan	Authority is kindly Requested to provide the Utility Shifting Plan.	As per RFP

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
5.	RFP Clause 2.2.2.2	<p>(ii) Additional Work Criteria: The sole Bidder or in case the Bidder being a Joint Venture, any member of Joint Venture shall necessarily demonstrate additional experience in construction of Major Bridge/ROBs/Flyovers/Tunnel in the last 7 (seven) financial years preceding the Bid Due Date or till the Bid Due Date i.e. shall have completed at least one similar Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover of 80% of the longest span of the structure proposed in this project or 100 m whichever is less i.e. 100 m and 40% of the length of Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover or 2 km, whichever is less, of the structure proposed in this project.</p>	<p>We would like to bring to the Authority's notice that the current project includes an ROB at Ch: 207.855 with a longest span of 57.2 m and a total bridge length of 321.6 m (4x27.6 m + 1x57.2 m +5x30.8 m). As per RFP Clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) Additional Work Criteria,' the bidder is required to have completed a structure with a span of at least 80% of 57.2 m, i.e, 45.76 m, and a total structure length of at least 40% of 321.6 m, i.e., 128.64 m.</p> <p>However, since the longest span in this project is less than 60 m, it is noted that most recent MoRTH and NHAI projects do not mandate the 'Additional Work Criteria' for such cases. Therefore, the Authority is kindly requested to modify the clause as follows:</p> <p>"If any Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover/Tunnel is (are) part of the project, then the sole Bidder or in case the Bidder being a Joint Venture, any member of Joint Venture shall necessarily demonstrate additional experience in construction of Major Bridge/ROBs/Flyovers/Tunnel in the last 7 (seven) financial years preceding the Bid Due Date or till the Bid Due Date i.e. shall have completed at least one similar Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover having length equal to or greater than: a) In case, longest span of Bridge/ROB/flyover is less than or equal to 60 m, no additional qualification is required.</p> <p>b) when longest span is more than 60 m:80% of the longest span or 100 m, whichever is less, of the structure proposed in this project and 40% of the length Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover or 2 km, whichever is less, of the structure proposed in this project."</p>	As per RFP
7.	General	GAD of Structures	Authority is kindly requested to furnish the GAD of Structures-	Indicative GADs for are uploaded

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
				separately for guidance of bidders.
1.	Draft Engineering Procurement and Construction (EPC) Agreement	Schedule H	Schedule H not found in Tender Documents. Hence, we request to the Authority to provide the same.	As per RFP
1.	Clause 7.3.2 Additional new bridges (a) Major Bridges	-	The total width of Major bridge structure proposed at Km. 168.865 is mentioned as 1x11.5m in CA, but as per TCS Drawings new Bridge width 1x14m given. Hence, there is a discrepancy between CA & TCS drawings. Please check the same and clarify.	Modified Schedule-B is uploaded separately.
2.	Clause 7.3.2 Additional new bridges (b) Minor Bridges	-	The proposed width given in CA for new construction of minor bridge structures at below mentioned locations does not match with the TCS drawing width:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 105.802 – 11m proposed Structure width is given in CA but as per TCS 3A, 13m width to be provided · 107.752 – 11m proposed Structure width is given in CA but as per TCS 3A, 13m width to be provided · 112.737 – 11m proposed Structure width is given in CA but as per TCS 1A, 13m width to be provided · 114.916 – 11m proposed Structure width is given in CA but as per TCS 1A, 13m width to be provided · 118.312 – 11m proposed Structure width is given in CA but as per TCS 1A, 13m width to be provided · 123.772 – 11m proposed Structure width is given in CA but as per TCS 1A, 13m width to be provided 	Modified Schedule-B is uploaded separately.

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 125.647 – 11m proposed Structure width is given in CA but as per TCS 1A, 13m width to be provided · 125.862 – 11m proposed Structure width is given in CA but as per TCS 1A, 13m width to be provided · 161.645 – 15m proposed Structure width is given in CA but as per TCS 3, 13m width to be provided <p>Hence, requesting you to kindly check the above structure's width as per the CA and TCS drawings Please check the same and clarify.</p>	
3.	Clause 2.9 Typical cross-sections of the Project Highway	-	<p>Proposed Structure widths given in CA do not match with the Highway TCS Drawings Please check the same and clarify.</p>	Modified Schedule-B is uploaded separately.
4.	Clause 2.9 Typical cross-sections of the Project Highway	-	<p>Chainage from 190+205 to Ch 191+555-1.350 Km length, TCS details are missing in the given TCS Schedule. Please provide the same.</p>	As per RFP
5.	NHAI/ Policy Guidelines/ Miscellaneous/ 2025, Policy Circular No. 18.111/2025	-	<p>The NHAI has decided that RS walls should not be used for gap slabs, partial-height walls, or as wing walls. Instead, RCC walls should be used where needed. Geo-composite drainage layers behind RS walls should be replaced with a 600 mm wide drainage layer. RS wall height should not exceed 10 m, and the approach slab should rest on the dirt wall bracket and fill, not on the return wall. Crash barriers must be built separately without being connected to the approach slab or pavement.</p>	As per RFP

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
	dated 21st October, 2025		These measures aim to improve the safety and durability of RS wall structures in future and ongoing highway projects. Considering the above circular for the specified Rail Over Bridge (ROB) proposed at Km 207.855 in CA. Please check the same and clarify.	
6.	General	-	The Structure DPR drawings are not included in the tender documents provided, but refer GAD note is written in the Remarks Column in the structure list provided in Schedule B. Kindly provide the Structure DPR drawings. Please provide the same.	Structure drawings are uploaded separately for guidance of bidders.
7.	General	-	Structures skew angles are not mentioned in the provided tender documents. Please provide the same.	Structure drawings are uploaded separately for guidance of bidders.
10.	General	-	Appendix A-I Reference system is not given in the tender documents. Please provide the same.	Modified Schedule-A is uploaded separately.
11.	Type of Terrain	-	Section 1 (ii) of Annex-I of Schedule A, Section 1.2 of Annex-I, Schedule B and Typical Cross Sections has defined the terrain as plain rolling and hilly terrain. Section 2.2 of Schedule B has defined design speed for the type of terrain. However, Plan and Profile is not designed considering the terrain as per the chainages given in above sections. Particularly, gradients are adopted as per the hilly terrain even in plain and rolling terrain defined in Schedule B. Further, as observed at site, entire terrain may be classified as hilly terrain. Request you to consider entire project as hilly terrain or give specific deviations for gradient and design speed where applicable.	As per RFP

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
12.	General	-	Please provide the Road furniture drawing. Please provide the same.	As per RFP
14.	Clause 2 (b) (ii) Schedule-C	-	Metal beam crash barrier length is given in CA but it has been noticed that Metal beam crash barrier is not shown in the TCS Drawings. Please Clarify.	As per Section 11 of Schedule-B Section 2(b) of Schedule-C of RFP
1.	2.2.2.2(ii) of RFP	(ii) Additional Work Criteria: The sole Bidder or in case the Bidder being a Joint Venture, any member of Joint Venture shall necessarily demonstrate additional experience in construction of Major Bridge/ROBs/Flyovers/Tunnel in the last 7 (seven) financial years preceding the Bid Due Date or till the Bid Due Date i.e. shall have completed at least one similar Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover of 80% of the longest span of the structure proposed in this project or 100 m whichever is less i.e. 100 m and 40% of the length of Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover or 2 km, whichever is less, of the structure proposed in this project.	However, as per Technical Schedule B of the RFP, the proposed Major Bridge under the Project has <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum Single Span: 57.2 meters • Total bridge length: $4 \times 27.6 + 1 \times 57.2 + 5 \times 30.8 = 321.6$ meters In this context, we wish to draw attention to the standard provision of Clause 2.2.2.2 (ii) in the Model RFP and MoRTH's updated circular of Modifications in EPC projects qualification dated 08 July, 2025, which specify that. If any Major Bridge/ROB/ Flyover/Tunnel is part of the project, then the sole Bidder or, in case the Bidder being a Joint Venture, any member of the Joint Venture shall necessarily demonstrate additional experience in construction of Major Bridge/ROBs/Flyovers/Tunnel in the last seven (7) financial years preceding the Bid Due Date or till the Bid Due Date, i.e., shall have completed at least one similar Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover having length equal to or greater than- (a) In case, longest span of Bridge/ROB/ Flyover is less than or equal to 60m, no additional qualification is required. (b) When longest span is more than 60m: 80% of the longest span of the structure proposed in this project or 100m, whichever is less, and 40% of the length of the longest structure proposed in this project or 2 km, whichever is less In view of the above, since the longest span of the proposed bridge is only 57.2 m less than 60 m), it appears that no additional qualification requirement should apply under Clause 22.22 (it).	As per RFP

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
			Therefore, we kindly request the Authority to amend or suitably modify the requirement in line with the above provision, stating that for this project, where the longest span of the proposed Major Bridge is 57.2 m (less than 60 m)- the additional qualification under Clause 2.2.2.2 (i) shall not be applicable.	
1.	2.2.2.6(i)c Page no. 26	The capital cost of the project should be more than 10% of the amount specified as the Estimated Project Cost;	We request you to please modify it as The capital cost of the project should be more than 5% of the amount specified as the Estimated Project Cost;	As per RFP
2.	2.2.2.6(ii) Page no. 26	However, receipts of or work executed amount less than Rs. 118.72 crore (Rs. one hundred eighteen crore and seventy-two lakhs only) shall not be reckoned as receipts for Eligible Projects.	We request you to please modify it as However, receipts of or work executed amount less than Rs. 59.36 crore (Rs. fifty nine crore and thirty six lakhs only) shall not be reckoned as receipts for Eligible Projects.	As per RFP
3.	Page 26 Notes	The actual capital cost of the project (i.e. without escalation) shall be considered for evaluation. The actual payment receipt (i.e. without escalation) shall be considered for evaluation.	We request you to allow escalation for actual capital cost of the project and actual payment receipt.	As per RFP
4.	2.2.2.5(iii)(b) Page no. 25	Core sector would be, deemed to include civil construction cost of power sector, commercial setups (SEZs etc.), airports, industrial	It is understood that Residential Projects are also considered for Evaluation of Threshold Capacity. Please clarify.	As per RFP

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
		parks/ estates, logistic parks, pipelines, irrigation, water supply, sewerage, stadium, hospitals, hotel, smart city, warehouses/ silos, oil and gas and real estate development.		
5.	2.2.2.6(i)	For demonstrating technical capacity and experience (the "Technical Capacity"), the Bidder shall, over the past 5 (five) financial years preceding the Bid Due Date, have received payments for construction of Eligible Project(s), or has undertaken construction works by itself in a PPP project, such that the sum total thereof, as further adjusted in accordance with clause 2.2.2.5 (i) & (ii), is more than Rs 1187.21 crore (Rupees one thousand one hundred eighty seven crore and twenty one lakh only) (the "Threshold Technical Capacity")	<p>We request you to please modify it as</p> <p>For demonstrating technical capacity and experience (the "Technical Capacity"), the Bidder shall, over the past 10 (Ten) financial years preceding the Bid Due Date, have received payments for construction of Eligible Project(s), or has undertaken construction works by itself in a PPP project, such that the sum total thereof, as further adjusted in accordance with clause 2.2.2.5 (i),& (ii) is more than Rs 1187.21 crore (Rupees one thousand one hundred eighty seven crore and twenty one lakh only) (the "Threshold Technical Capacity").</p>	As per RFP
2.	Technical Schedule Annex-I (Schedule B)	Four Lane with Rigid Pavement in Built Up Sections: Four Lane with paved shoulders configuration including concrete	Please Provide design speed criteria for hilly terrain stretches and confirm if speed relaxation (60 kmph) applies.	As per RFP

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
	1.2b	drain cum footpath (in built-up area) shall be constructed as mentioned in table below in accordance with IRC: SP: 84-2019		
3.	Notice Inviting Bid	Completion Period 2 Years	Considering completion period the scope of work and utility shifting is included, we request to extend project time period to 36 months.	As per RFP
5.	Design Speed	The design speed shall be ruling speed of 100 km/hr with minimum 80 km /hr [wherever ROW is restricted] for plain/rolling terrain & ruling speed 60 km/hr with minimum 40 km hilly Terrain, In urban stretches the design speed is restricted as per table in para 2.3 below, as per the maximum radius of curves in those sections as the development is proposed within the extent of available land.	<p>6. Please confirm if design parameters to follow IRC-SP-73/84 or MORTH circular dated 17.07.2020 (latest)</p> <p>2. We request authority to provide chainage wise ROW details, terrain classification and existing alignment geometry to finalise the design speed as per clause – particularly where minimum design speed are applicable.</p>	As per RFP
6.	Schedule H	Schedule H is not given	7. The tender does not include Schedule H (Contract Price Weightages), so request you to kindly provide Schedule H clearly indicating work item wise and milestone wise weightages.	Schedule-H is uploaded separately.
1.	Genera		8. I would like to inform you that the complete Technical Bid Documents are currently not available for viewing or download on the official portals of the Central Public Procurement Portal (CPPP) https://eprocure.gov.in/eprocure/app and BIMS	All tender documents are uploaded on portal

Sl.	Clause reference	Description	Query	Reply
			<p>https://bims.gov.in/. Due to the unavailability of these documents, it is difficult to carry out the evaluation of the tenders for the following proposed projects:</p>	