PRE-BID CLARIFICATIONS

"Rehabilitation of Radhanpur (Km 0+000) to Chanasma (Km 60+410) section of SH-55" of Second Gujarat State Highway Project (GSHP-II/EPC/02)

Sl. No	Clause Ref	Description	Query	Response
1	General	DPR of this project should be uploaded with Tender Documents for		Project documents are uploaded on the
		Technical understanding of provision made in project.		e-procurement portal.
2	Annexure-I of Schedule B para 2.2	 As per Annexure-I of Schedule B para 2.2, "FRL" given in profile shall be followed as minimum. FRL of Structures shall not be reduced/lowered than that of existing structure. As per given profile in tender documents, in most of stretches profile having raising around 25 cm. to 50 cm. The minimum overlay as per para 5.4.2 is given 70 mm RAP + 90 mm DBM + 50 mm BC, i.e. 210 mm, out of which 50 mm existing BT surface is removed/scarified, than accordingly 160 mm raising over existing BT level is provided. Now if raising as per profile is more than 160 mm than granular layer 	 ❖ Than clarifications required as below: ➤ Existing BT surface is scarified upto 50 mm or whole BT layer of existing road, to match design profile level	The provision "The FRL given in profile shall be followed as minimum" given under para 2.2 of Annex-I (Schedule B) shall prevail. Please refer Addendum-2, Sl. No. 33.
3	Para 7.8	As per Para 7.8, "Any increase in length and width of structure & bridges specified here in above due to site condition or investigation finding shall be treated as covered in scope of works. The actual dimensions required on the bases of detailed studies & investigations shall be determined by the contractor in accordance with specifications & standards. Any variations in length, width or any other detail specified in The Schedule-B shall not constitute a change of scope." As per statement for minor bridge & for major bridge in Para 7.3.1 & 7.3.2 respectively, most of the structure is stated as repair & retain.	granular layer is to be provided upto formation width or not? Than clarification required for: Looking to the above, if as per hydraulic analysis & investigation no. of Span is to be increase for Bridge/minor bridge, than this to be consider as change of scope or not? Width of existing major bridge is around 7.0 mt. which is less than formation width i.e. 12mt, than any change in width suggested afterword for major bridge, than it is considered as change of scope or not?	Schedule B prevails.
4	Para 8.4	As per Para 8.4. Pedestrian Guard Rail Please provide location of pedestrian Guard Rail	us change of scope of novi	Pedestrian Guard rail shall be provided as per para no 2.5 of Schedule B.
5	Para 8.6	As per Para 8.6. 3D painting of Traffic signs on Pavement Please provide location of 3D painting of Traffic signs on Pavement.		3D painting of Traffic signs on Pavement shall be provided as per para no 8.6 of Schedule B; which is clear.
6	Para 8.8	As per Para 8.8. Raised Pavement markers/Road Studs Please provide location of Raised Pavement markers/Road Studs.		Raised Pavement markers/Road Studs shall be provided as per para no 8.8 of Schedule B; which is clear.
7	Para 9.3	As per Para 9.3. Cattle Crossing Zone Please provide location of Cattle Crossing Zone.		Schedule B prevails.

Sl. No	Clause Ref	Description	Query	Response	
8	Para 7.2.2 & 7.3.1	As per shown in Para 7.2.2 & 7.3.1, structure at Ch. 3+775 & 4+196 is missing from the list given in Para 7.3.1	please clarify.	Para 7.2.2 provides "The schedule of the Culverts (including new culverts)" which includes the structure at Ch. 3+775 & 4+196. Para 7.3.1 provides "The schedule of the Minor Bridges (including replacement of existing pipe culverts by reconstruction of minor bridges)" Stipulations are clear.	
9	-	As per SP-23. Pg No. 25, Para-(i) "The vertical alignment should provide for a smooth longitudinal profile consistent with category of the road and lie of the terrain. Grade changes should not be too frequent as to cause kinks and visual discontinuities in the profile. Desirably, there should be no change in grade within a distance of 150 m." - But here in this profile there is so many grade changes in every km (around at every 70 to 80mt.) - Looking to the above at the time of design to be given by the contractor above statement of IRC-SP-23 is to be followed or not?	Please clarify.	Relevant provision of IRC-SP-23 shall be followed provided that the minimum specified FRL is maintained. Schedule B prevails.	
10	-	Looking at the Plan & profile, 2 to 3 no. of Horizontal curve is design with speed lower than 100 KMPH, can we follow the same for design.		Schedule B prevails.	
11	-	At many location of minor bridge profile level is shown raising around 25 to 50 cm and as per Para 7.2.2 shows to retain or repair of minor bridge, in this situation design level is to be kept as per existing structure level, than design profile level is reduced which restricted by Para 2.2.	Please clarify.	The design level of minor and major bridges shall be kept as per existing structure level. Refer Addendum-2, Sl. No. 33.	
12	-	From Ch. 49.800 to Ch. 50.050 existing road is four lane. In this Ch,as per drawing showing proposed two lane(strengthening of existing road Type B section).	Please clarify.	Refer Addendum-2, Sl. No. 33.	
13	-	As per local inquiry & investigation in near past, road section from Radhanpur to Sami is heavily overtopped at many location. As per Para 7.2.2 only 3 new pipe culvert and 1 new box culvert is proposed. But if as per hydraulic analysis & investigation more structures are to be required, then these structures are considered as COS or Not? (in ref to Para no. 7.8.)		Refer Sl. No 3 above.	
14	Para 7.2.2	As per statement in Para 7.2.2 most of the existing structures is to be retain & repair. As per given profile the existing level & design level is as below. Chainage Existing level Design level Difference 1+357 28.750 28.813 0.063 mt.	- Looking to the above, at most of the location of structure is shown raising around 25cm to 50cm. If structure is to be retain & repair then how it is possible to raise this level, please	Refer Addendum-2, Sl. No. 33.	

Sl.	Clause	Description				Query	Response
No	Ref	·					•
		1+641	28.937	28.772	-0.165 mt.	clarify.	
		2+126	30.091	30.291	0.2 mt.	- If width of minor bridge is required	No change of scope.
		2+600	28.658	28.690	0.032 mt.		Two change of scope.
		2+703	28.064	28.716	0.652 mt	to be increase as per design profile,	
		3+143	28.511	28.812	0.301 mt.	than is it considered as COS or not?	
		3+571	27.314	27.443	0.129 mt.		
		3+870	28.268	28.407	0.139 mt.		
		5+217	27.918	28.271	0.353 mt.		
		9+852	29.106	31.510	2.404 mt.		
		10+435	31.325	31.853	0.528 mt.		
		11+710	32.825	32.757	-0.068 mt.		
		13+314	30.818	31.119	0.301 mt.		
		13+909	28.821	29.429	0.608 mt.		
		15+941	29.482	29.813	0.331 mt.		
		16+608	30.714	30.804	0.09 mt.		
		17+280	30.661	31.233	0.572 mt.		
		17+925	31.082	31.333	0.251 mt.		
		18+873	31.458	31.574	0.116 mt.		
		19+413	28.702	34.320	5.618 mt.		
		19+930	31.199	32.084	0.885 mt.		
		20+415	30.514	32.065	1.551 mt.		
		32+583	41.404	41.582	0.178 mt.		
		33+032	39.847	39.952	0.105 mt.		
		33+706	43.277	43.522	0.245 mt.		
		34+416	40.260	40.581	0.321 mt.		
		42+670	52.383	52.468	0.085 mt.		
		47+250	49.249	49.578	0.329 mt.		
1.5	D 722	48+667	50.575	50.890	0.315 mt.	Y61 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	D C CI N 11 1
15	Para 7.3.2				t repair, than as per	If bridge is to be repair & retain than how	Refer Sl. No. 11 above.
		profile, existing leve				it possible to maintain to profile level as	
		Chainage	Existing level	Design level	Difference	per tender conditions?	
		4+623	30.867	31.981	1.114 mt.		
		6+675	31.868	33.487	1.619 mt.		
		52+010	59.930	59.470	- 0.46 mt.		
16	-	- At Ch. 4+575 to 4+675 near major bridge length of sumit curve is given		➤ Profile is to be design for SSD, ISD or	Refer Sl. No. 9 & 10 above.		
		40 mt. As per IRC	SP 23 minimur	n length is 60.0	mts for speed 100	OSD, please clarify.	
		KM/HR.		C	1	Given profile is for what design speed	
		Can we consider	decian speed less	er than 100 for de	ecian?	and for what sight distance	
		Can we consider	design speed less	ci man 100 ioi uc	ongii:	(SSD/ISD/OSD), please clarify.	
						➤ Please clarify above Para for other two	
						bridges also.	
17	-	At Ch. 6+552 near	major bridge exis	ting level from C	Ch. 5+725 to 5+800.	please clarify & confirm level of	Refer Sl. No. 11 above.
		level difference bety				FRL/existing level.	
18		At Ch. 52+010 nea				Tite, emoting to voi.	Refer Sl. No. 11 above.
10	_						Keiei Si. No. 11 above.
		C	epair & retain, th	en now it possible	le to cut the level of		
		existing bridge.					

Sl. No	Clause Ref	Description	Query	Response
19	-	In given profile at most of the structure invert level is not given & also at sum structure OGL level is not shown. So, it is difficult for bidder to calculate actual cost of structure so please provide invert level/OGL level.		Refer Sl. No 11 above.
20	-	Looking to the profile most of the existing road centre level & OGL (LHS/RHS) is having minor difference please confirm & clarify this level & also please clarify at what distance OGL is taken from Road edge.		Refer Addendum-2, Sl. No. 33.
21	-	Please confirm level at various following chainages: Ch. 19+425, 28+050, 30+925 to 31+000, 31+300 to 31+350, 38+225, 41+050 etc.		Refer Addendum-2, Sl. No. 33.
22	-	As per profile between Ch. 39+400 to 39+500, profile shows cutting around -26 to -70 cm. this location is surrounded Harij Bus stand, Hotels & Shopping mall. Than at this location cutting is not advisable.	Please clarify.	Refer Addendum-2, Sl. No. 33.
23	-	 HFL line/HFL is not shown in profile As per IRC –SP-73 Para 4.2.1 i) No section of the road is overtopped. Top of subgrade shall be at least 0.5mabove the general ground level. ii) The bottom of sub-grade shall be 1.0 m above the High Flood Level (HFL)/level of water table. The HFL should be decided by intelligent inspections,local observations, enquiries and studying the past records. As per past record section between Radhanpur to Sami at many place road length is overtopped, 	Please clarify whether we have to follow the design profile as per statement given IRC-SP-73 Para 4.2.1 as above.	Refer the deviation mentioned in Schedule D for Clause 4.2.1 of IRC-SP-73.
24	Para 2.4.2 specific experience.	Minimum experience in Bituminous work is 2, 05,000 cum Per Year. Required:- Minimum experience in Bituminous work is very much higher side,	Please reduce this Qty as per NHAI or Government of Gujarat Criteria. This is for healthy Competition.	Refer Addendum-2, Sl. No. 17.
25	Para 2.4.2 specific experience.	 Wet Mix Macadam: 20,000 cum per year Granular Subbase: 29,500 cum per year R.C.C. works: 37,000 cum per year 	Please add the P.C.C. along with R.C.C. as mention above.	Refer Addendum-2, Sl. No. 17.
26	-	According to the Tender documents Last date for the online submission of bid is 29.04.2019 @ 12.00 Hrs. Kindly note that to prepare an exact estimation at per your requirement and to make our best competitive offer we need more times and accordingly due to the Financial year ending coming close and Election time is going on.	We request you to extend the Last date for the online submission of bid at least 30 days from the present last date of submission.	Refer Addendum-2 / (n) procure portal for revision in dates, if any.
27	2.6 of Section-3	The equipment listed above should not be older than 7 years of age.	If the bidder don't have within 7 years age equipment than Undertaking at the time of bidding is allow for the same.	Undertaking is allowed as already mentioned in the bid document at last para (bullet) of 2.6 Equipment.