

From Editors Desk

Taj Mahal Hotel, V.T Station, Gate Way of India, this all places have earned a bearing in all our minds, that they are world class building. Above all they have been heritage building which our city is proud of. As an architect we value the rich heritage of our city.

As all the Mumbaikar are concerned about preserving our heritage, and maintaining these structures, so is our Municipal Corporation. Going a step forward, our BMC, published list of heritage structures some of which have already been demolished and new building are constructed in its place

Such is the pace of working of our authorities that list prepared few year back have been published without checking the authenticity of the site conditions. Over and above a heritage committee who's NOC is required before getting approval of BMC have also been taken by surprise of recent government notification

Peata as always was quick to arrange a seminar on this issue for our members on 5th Nov 2012 at Manek Hall. Our President Shri Shirish Sukhatme took special efforts to invite all the concerned dignitaries for this Seminar. Our Past President Shri Pravin Kanekar along with Shri Uday Warty also gave in their valuable inputs for the seminar.

Editor Enews



Samir R Hingoo



SEMINAR ON HERITAGE CONSERVATION

(AN HONOUR OR OBSTACLE)

DATED 5TH NOVEMBER 2012

Recently M.C.G.M., has published new list of Heritage Building and Precincts and also amended and appended to earlier list. Obtaining permission from Heritage Committee itself is a painful task and long process. Since publishing of new list there is flow of news cum articles published in News Papers like the Maharashtra Times, Lok-Satta, Times of India and Indian Express. There is wave of fear of blocking the development in this financial capital of India. Taking this issue head on our president Shri Shirish Sukhatme along with executive committee of Peata had arranged a seminar on this burning issue in the month of November.

Shri. V. Rangnathan-(M.H.C.C president) Shri D. M. Sukthankar, (former M.H.C.C president) and panel of speakers, Dr. Varsha Shirgaonkar, (Noted Historian) Shri. Ram Savani (Specialist in Heritage Bldg Repairs) Ms. Lalita Gupta (Deputy Municipal Architect) Shri. Uday Warty, Shri Sandip Isore gave in their views and explained procedure in obtaining permission from authorities .and thus contributed, for seminar on Heritage Conservation – Honour or obstacle.

Shri Shirish Sukhatme in the presidential address to the audience explained the need for heritage conservation but questioned the delay on part of authorities for repairs and redevelopment of heritage structures, and the requested the authorities to simplify the approval procedure.

Shri Yomesh Rao who was master of ceremony conducted the seminar with his professional style and was applauded by the audience. Samir R Hingoo, gave the Vote Of Thanks Speech and concluded the seminar

Development Control Rules for Mumbai (As amended upto 26th January, 2012)

- Lexicons define the term heritage as ‘Property that can be inherited/ ‘Any condition or culture which is allotted or handed down to one, as by ancestors ‘The chosen people of God as the Israelites or the Christian elect.
- No Act for Heritage Conservation demands to seek No Objection Certificate from the Heritage Committee for redevelopment proposals that fall in the Proposed Heritage List.
- Sub Rule (3) of Rule 67 of the DCR for Mumbai – Preparation of list of Heritage Buildings and Heritage Precincts states ‘The said list of buildings, artifacts, structures and precincts of historical, and/or aesthetical and/or architectural and/or cultural value to which this regulation applies shall not form part of this regulation for the purpose of section 37 of the Maharashtra Regional and Town Planning Act, 1966. This list may be supplemented, altered, deleted or modified from time to time by Government on receipt of proposal from the Commissioner or from the said heritage conservation Committee, or by the Government Suo Motu, provided that before the list is supplemented, altered, deleted or modified, objection and suggestion from the public be invited and duly considered by the Commissioner and/or by the Government.
- Grading of the Listed Buildings/ Listed Precincts-In the last column of the said list of Heritage Building, Heritage Precincts “Grades” such as I, II, III have been indicated. The meaning of these grades are as follows

GRADE I	GRADE II	GRADE III
<p>A. Definition – Heritage Grade- I comprises of buildings, and precincts of National or historical importance, embodying excellence in architectural style, design, technology and material uses, they may be associated with a great historical event, personality, movement or institution. They have been and are the prime landmarks of the city.</p>	<p>A. Scope – Heritage Grade II comprises building/ precincts, of regional or local importance, possessing special architectural or aesthetical merit or cultural or historical value, through of a lower order than that of heritage grade I. They are local landmarks contributing to the image and identity of the city. They may be the work of master craftsman or may be models of proportion and ornamentation, or designed to suit particular climate. Heritage Grade II buildings within the premises (open space/compound) of which independent/separate additional building(s)/ structure(s) may be permitted to be constructed, owing to the availability of adequate surrounding open space, FSI, have been assigned Grade II B. The remaining Grade II buildings have been assigned Grade II A.</p>	<p>Heritage Grade III comprises of buildings and precincts of importance for town space, they evoke architectural, aesthetic or sociological interest though not as much as in Heritage Grade II. This contribute to determine the character of the locality, and can be representative of a lifestyle or a particular community or region and may also be distinguished by setting on a street line or special character of the façade and uniformity of height, width and scale.</p>

PICTORIAL REPRESENTATION OF THE EVENT



**SHRI. YOMESH RAO.
MCO**



SHRI SHIRISH SUKHATME



**Architect Shri. Jayant Vaidya,
making his key note speech.**



**Shri. Sandeep Isore
giving his Presentation**



**M.H.C.C. Chairman
Shri. V. Ranganathan**



SHRI WARTY



**Architect Smt. Lalita Gupta,
explaining to the crowd what
procedures to be followed.**



**MHCC. Executive Chairman
SHRI. D. M. SUKHTANKAR**



**S.N.D.T Collage Lecturer
Smt. Dr. Varsha Shirgaonkar**



Shri Shirish Sukhatme & Shri D.M. Sukthankar



M.H.C.C. Chairman, Shri D.M. Sukthankar, being felicitated by Present Chairman M.H.C.C Shri. V. Ranganathan with Shawl & Coconut.



Deputy Municipal Architect being offered Flower of Bouquet by Immediate President Shri. Pravin Kanekar.



M.H.C.C. Chairman being felicitated with Memento.



Shri. Kuknoor Chief Engineer (DP), being felicitated by SHRI D.M.SUKTHANKAR.



Smt. Dr. Varsha Shirgaonkar, felicitated by Vice President Shri. Manoj Dubal.



SMT. DR. VARSHA SHIRGAONKAR, presenting her Book to PEATA



Principal SHRI. DR. RAJIV MISHRA being felicitated by M.H.C.C. Chairman SHRI. V. RANGANATHAN



**Vote Of Thanks by
SHRI. SAMIR HINGOO.**



**SHRI. RAM SAVANI
Specialist in Heritage Bldg Repairs**



Manoj Dubal & Eeshan Vaidya in Conversation



Varsha Shirgaonkar & D.M. Sukthankar



Shri. Yomesh Rao & Shri. Samir Hingoo.



Architect Smt. Lalita Gupta, Shri Shirish Sukhatme & Shri. Pravin Kanekar.



Shri Dinesh Shah, Shri Pravin Kanekar & Uday Warty



Shri D.M. Sukthankar & Shri Jayant Vaidya



Audience during the seminar



Shri Anil Patil, Shri Manoj Daisaria & Shri Dilip Deshmukh

Meeting with Chief Engineer (D.P)

Peata (I) met Chief Engineer (D.P) Shri Kuknoor and discussed following point and sought clarification for approval procedure. President Shri Shirish Sukhatme, alongwith Shri Pravin Kanekar, Shri Manoj Mubal, Shri Sunil Deole & other Peata members attended the meeting. Decisions and reply from the authorities are awaited and shall be updated in next editions of Enews.

SR. NO.	ISSUE	PEATA'S SUGGESTION
1.	a) Pre-requisite for submission of proposal P.R. Card in words.	a) P.R. card in words is not issued by City Survey office unless the letter to issue P.R.C. in words is given by M.C.G.M. to the City Survey Office. Further, they insist file number to be mentioned. Hence, proposal should be accepted without insisting P.R.C. in words and the letter should be forwarded to the City Survey office by Bldg. Proposal Department immediately on acceptance of proposal. Meanwhile, the files can be processed for concession & IOD to be issued. P.R.C. in words to be insisted before grant of C.C. so as to save time.
	b) N.O.C. from Railway Authority	b) Also earlier policy to granting approval to be continued which is Restricted to F.S.I 0.75 in absence of P.R.C in words.
	c) Title certificate from solicitor	c) Railway authority is insisting the copy of the I.O.D. before processing N.O.C. Hence, the same should be insisted before C.C. as per earlier policy. Title certificate from advocate should also be accepted.
2.	In case of artificially ventilated shaft provided with dimension not more than D.C.R. 42 (2) and further two sides of such ventilation shaft is abutting toilet/W.C./bathroom only, then such a ventilation shaft can be allowed free of FSI provided the same is open to sky right from ground level.	As per D.C. Reg. this provision is to accommodate ventilation to W.C., bath, toilets, staircase & stores. Further as per the planning it will not be always possible to provide toilets on two sides of the ventilation shaft. Even, if toilet is provided on one side ventilation shaft is required as per D.C. Reg. Further, if stilt is proposed in the building then ventilation shaft can be from ground level. However if shopping is proposed at ground level or podiums are proposed then the ventilation shaft will be above shopping or above podiums. Hence, ventilation shaft may be allowed free of FSI even it affects one toilet / staircase etc. as planning requirement.

SR. NO.	ISSUE	PEATA'S SUGGESTION
3.	The top of chajja, cornice, weather shade, sun breaker etc. provided as per Regulation 35 (7) (xii) and (xiii) shall be atleast 600 mm below the floor level immediately above and the thickness of such chajja, cornice etc. shall not be more than 150 mm. Further, no facia/railing of any kind shall be permitted for such chajja, cornice, weather shade, sun breaker etc.	Vertical fins, cornices at the edge of chajja etc. should also be permitted free of FSI for aesthetical purpose.
4.	Areas covered by staircases / lift wells including lobbies as specified, excluding those covered under D.C. Regulation No. 35 (2) (iii) with special written permission of the Commissioner subject to payment of premium.	The regulation 35 (2)(iv) says "lobbies as specified" The lift lobbies to be permitted including the staircase cut-off lobbies which cannot be merged into the habitable area. (VARIOUS SKETCH ENCLOSED)
5.	Submission of new proposal with AUTO DCR is being insisted.	Due to the modification in D.C. Reg. on 06-01-2012 the provision of D.C. Regulations have changed i.e. DCR 35 (2), 35 (3), 35 (4) and other regulations. The AUTO DCR software is not updated. Hence, AUTO DCR should not be insisted.
6.	NOC /Remarks for the plots less than 2500 sq.mt.	As per the policy circular under No.CHE/1280/DP/ GEN dated 23.10.2008 the NOC /Remarks for the plots below 2500 sq.mt. is not required.
7.	As per the requirements of the Civil Aviation Authority, WGS co-ordinates of the plots are required to be submitted. The policy circular to that effect is already issued to that effect by D.P. Department. However, D.P. Department is insisting co-ordinates to be submitted from private surveyor.	As per the circular only tentative co-ordinates of the plot are to be submitted by the Architect along with the application for WGS co-ordinates and hence the co-ordinates from private surveyor should not be insisted as MCGM has digitized plan for entire Mumbai.
8.	D.P. Remarks are issued manually on submission of application	Since M.C.G.M. has computerized D.P. Remarks. The same can be made available online by charging necessary fees.
9.	Fees / charges are insisted by the concerned department before issuing N.O.C. / Remarks.	As per policy circular under No.DIR/E.S.&P/3775 /MC dated 18.02.2012, the concerned department should issue remarks /NOC along with duly signed demand letter with the condition of paying fees / charges before IOD/CC. and recovery shall be ensured by B.P. Section. The said circular should be implemented in spirit.

SR. NO.	ISSUE	PEATA'S SUGGESTION
10.	In case redevelopment in suburbs auncency of existing area for rehab.	In case of redevelopment in suburbs, if the approved plans/Assessment department extract is not available, then the existing building plan measured by the Architect and submitted shall be verified on site by concerned Sub-Engineer to the extent of plot potential for considering rehab area for fungible FSI purpose or city survey plan.
11.	Premium for deficiency in open space is charged 100% for the fungible compensatory FSI by Bldg. proposal department.	Premium for deficiency in open space for fungible F.S.I. should be charged in proportion to the TDR utilized.
12.	The development permission for the buildable reservation and for user permissible in Res./Commercial zone in plot situated in I2 & I3 zone is issued with a validity of 2 years and thereafter to be revalidated.	As per M.R. & T.P. Act, C.C. for the building is valid for one year and further for three years if the work is not started. If the work is started, then the C.C. is valid indefinitely. Hence, if C.C. is granted and the work is completed upto plinth level, the revalidation of development permission should not be insisted.
13.	To form a separate RTI cell in each building proposal office.	As the RTI application are received in large number, the concerned engineers have to devote lot of time to reply, causing delay in approvals. Hence, a separate RTI cell should be formed in each building proposal office.
14.	For MHADA plots, N.O.C. from MHADA is insisted before submission of proposal.	MHADA is not granting N.O.C. till the scrutiny fees is paid to MCGM for acceptance of proposal and the proposals are not accepted till MHADA NOC is obtained. Hence, offer letter should be sufficient for acceptance of the proposal. Further, IOD should be issued as MHADA requires copy of the approved plan inorder to calculate the premium to be paid to MHADA before issue of NOC. The NOC from MHADA should be insisted before grant of C.C.
15.	To start SAP module for acceptance of payment in Vikhroli office.	It is inconvenient for Architects to make payment at 'S' ward or 'N'. Hence SAP module be started at Vikhroli B. P. office

SR. NO.	ISSUE	PEATA'S SUGGESTION
16.	The area affected by Nalla and Nalla widening along with service road should not be considered as reservation in case if land is buildable after Nalla and its widening.	As per preamble of the notification it is very clear that in case where the land becomes unbuildable due to Nalla and its widening the same should be treated as D.P. Reservation and TDR to be granted in order to compensate the land owners as per DRC 34. Hence, if the land is buildable the Nalla should not be considered as D.P. Reservation.
17.	To allow fungible FSI for plots situated in NDZ.	DCR 33 (4) states that fungible FSI is to be allowed over and above permissible FSI in the zone and hence the fungible FSI should be allowed in the plots situated in NDZ.
18.	To allow inaccessible pocket terraces on upper floors with slope 1:5.	Pocket terraces are created at upper floors due to planning constraints particularly in case of redevelopment where in specific areas are to be given to the tenants. These terraces may therefore be allowed free of FSI with slope of 1:5.
19.	To allow society office free of FSI	As per IOD conditions & OCC. Conditions the developer has to register society and hence society office should be permitted at initial stage so as to avoid approvals later on by the registered society.
20.	To allow 2% fitness centre free of FSI as per DCR 38 (32)	DCR 38 (32) states that fitness centre should be allowed for the building proposed to be constructed for the use of existing or proposed Co.op.Hsg.Soc. or on Apartment owners association. Further, DCR 38 (32), condition No.(i) states that where occupation is granted the application should be made by the Regd. Society. Hence, fitness centre as per DCR 38 (32) & 35(2) (xvii) should be allowed free of FSI at initial stage.
21.	Not to insist brochure for mechanized parking by E.E.T.&C.	E.E.T& C is insisting brochure for mechanized parking from the manufacturer showing the exact numbers of car-parking proposed in the plan. The manufacturer, therefore insist on agreement with the developer. However, the car-parking are required to be installed after 2 to 3 years. This is creating unnecessary problems with the developers. The modified D.C. Regulations are very clear with respect to the numbers of car-parking and any additional car parking level is to be counted in FSI. Hence, the brochure should not be insisted.
22.	Not to restrict 10% plinth area for Electric Sub-station, receiving station, watchman's cabin etc. in NDZ.	As per DCR 60, the FSI for I.T. user is 0.20 and the plinth to be restricted to 10%. The areas of electric sub-station, receiving station watchman's cabin etc. are utilized & are free of FSI, the restriction of 10% should not be applied on such utilities.

SR. NO.	ISSUE	PEATA'S SUGGESTION
23.	Revision of Bldg. Prop. Manual	It is suggested that so many regulations have changed and a Bldg. proposal manual be prepared by forming study group from MCGM & PEATA (I) with a time bond programme of 2 to 3 months..
24.	Not to insist restriction of 20% flats with area of 50 sq.mt. in case of I to R for TDR component.	TDR is additional FSI and there cannot be any restriction. In all cases of buildable reservation, the % of built-up area to be given to MCGM is only on the plot potential and not on TDR. Hence the restriction on flat size of 50 sq.mt. for 20% permissible area should be on plot potential only and not on TDR component.
25.	Restriction of C.C. to 50% of permissible FSI (excluding TDR) incase of clearance of built-up setback.	As per the circular, the C.C. is to be restricted to 50% till the built-up set back is handed over to MCGM free of encumbrance & free of cost. The circular is for built-up setback and should not be applied for open setback / D.P. Road.
26.	Not to insist revise NOC from CFO & E.E.T. & C for minor changes in the plan.	In case of minor changes during scrutiny, the revise NOC from CFO & E.E.T. & C is being insisted before forwarding the file to the Hon'ble M.C. The same should be insisted before grant of C.C. as there are minor corrections so as to avoid delays.
27.	As per modified DCR 35 (4) except all the areas exempted under DCR 35 (2) will be required to be counted in Fungible compensatory FSI	The common passages upto 2 meter width for rehab component are exempted under DCR 33 (10) under 6.10 and the concessions in the cases of DCR 33 (10) are available for redevelopment under 33 (7). As this is specifically permitted under separate regulation the same should be permitted free of FSI in case of 33 (7)
28.	Area of the non-cessed structures to the extent of 25% of gross plot area is entitled for FSI under DCR 33 (7) modified.	This is permitted in case of FSI 3.00 the same also should be applicable in the cases of rehab + 50% incentive FSI cases also.
29.	Not to insist NOC from Reliance / Tata for electric sub-station for the area upto 1500 sq.mt.	The same was already approved by the then M.C. and hence policy circular to be issued to that effect
30.	To persue & streamline the process for the proposal for which NOC. From Ministry of Defence is required for the plot in the vicinity near Juhu & Akruli.	In order to streamline the NOC from Ministry of Defence for the plot situated in vicinity of Defence, PEATA (I) suggest to streamline the procedure by MCGM with Ministry of Defence so as to avoid delays.
31.	To allow T.D.R. loading in Gaothan.	As per DCR 34, TDR loading is allowed in Gaothan area. Such cases are also approved in the past. Hence Peata suggests to allow T.D.R. loading in Gaothan area.

DID YOU READ THIS

BMC exempts most engineers from pothole fines

Linah Baliga | TNN

Mumbai: The BMC 'crack-down' on errant junior civic engineers over delays in fixing potholes seems to have lost steam, with the civic body exempting most of them from paying the penalty amount for undue delays.

In September, the BMC had imposed a collective fine of Rs 1.3 crore on 38 sub-engineers from the roads department for not meeting the 48-hour deadline to fill up potholes. After protests from the engineers' association, the BMC watered

down the fine amount to Rs 8.34 lakh, citing faulty calculations.

However, civic sources told TOI that on November 4, the BMC gave a patient hearing to most sub-engineers and decided to waive their fine amount.

"They issued a memo to us and on November 4 exempted us from having to pay the fines. They verbally told us that we don't have to pay the fine amount and listened to our explanations. The pothole-tracking software is new and we were not familiar with its use. We also didn't have the IDs of most contractors. We told offi-

BMC fines contractors ₹1.2cr for delay in fixing potholes



TOI's report on September 6

cialists that we were not responsible for penalties and only the contractors should be held responsible. We also told them about the technical problems due to which the potholes couldn't be attended to within the time limit. All sub-engineers from the island city and

western suburbs who had received a memo have been exempted from the fine amount," said a civic official.

GM Agarwal, chief engineer (roads) said, "Those engineers who were overburdened with work have been exempted from paying the fine. I cannot comment on whether all 38 engineers have been let off, as I do not have the file with me at present. The process is still on. We are listening to their explanations and have to arrive at an inference in some cases."

According to the sub-engineers, the fault was with the

pothole-tracking software, on the basis of which fine amounts were calculated. Every engineer was fined Rs 3 lakh, and after a revision the fines dropped to Rs 23,000 per person. Contractors have been fined Rs 1.86 crore for the delays.

The BMC had laid down a 48-hour deadline for contractors and sub-engineers to get potholes filled and had set a Rs-1,000 fine per day for delays. The maximum fine after revision was Rs 1.68 lakh for G-south ward (Worli, Prabhadevi) and the lowest was Rs 1,000 for A ward (CST-Colaba).

ACB books 3 BMC officials for giving playground to builder

Mumbai Mirror Bureau
mirmirfeedback@indiatimes.com

Three civic body officials have been booked by the Anti Corruption Bureau (ACB) for criminal misconduct, for allegedly granting permissions to a developer for a plot in Chembur, which had been reserved for a playground. The officers, ACB has alleged, were aware that the plot was reserved and that the BMC had rejected its development in the past.

Then BMC's assistant engineer Goswami, superintending engineer Ingawale, and junior engineer Khandke, all associated with the BMC's building proposals department of the eastern suburbs, have been booked by ACB. No arrests have been made so far.

According to ACB sources, Dhananjay Nana Shinde, the owner of a plot no 654 in Chembur Village, had approached BMC in 1988 for its development. But his proposal was rejected on grounds that 15 per cent of the plot was reserved for a playground. Despite this, 20 years later, Shinde, in 2008, submitted a fresh proposal to the BMC to develop the plot. He allegedly did not disclose the earlier refusal at the time.

The ACB's First Information Report (FIR) further alleges that the ar-



The officers were allegedly aware that BMC had rejected the plot's development

chitect Shinde hired and the developer Aims Consultant also endorsed the proposal without ascertaining the status of the plot as per the development plan.

Once the proposal was submitted to the executive engineer (building proposals), eastern suburbs, he forwarded it to the assistant engineer (survey) for his remarks.

The assistant engineer returned the file with a remark that the documents related to the plot were damaged, due to which no opinion could

be given. ACB alleged that Khandke inspected the plot, and despite having found playground equipment, did not mention the fact in his report and gave a positive opinion about the development proposal.

Goswami and Ingawale, though aware that the proposal to develop the Chembur plot was rejected in 1988 due to a reservation issue, granted approval to the project and issued an Intention of Disapproval (IOD), a document which signifies a formal approval, alleged the ACB.

BMC chalks out new policy for rooftop eateries

Bhavika Jain | TNN

Mumbai: In a boost to rooftop eateries in the city, the BMC has chalked out a new policy to give eating house licences to such hotels.

According to the new policy, there are two mandates that a hotel which wants to have a rooftop eating space needs to fulfill. The first one is that the terrace should be a part of the hotel, and that of the total area of a terrace, there should be construction on at least 300 sq-ft, and the rest can be used for seating. The second mandate is that the terrace should be a part of the computed FSI available on the building.

"If these two mandates are fulfilled, the BMC will issue eating house licence to the rooftop hotel," said additional municipal commissioner, Manisha Mhaikar. She also added that there are a few hotels that are running such eateries illegally. The BMC will conduct a survey and if it finds such hotels, action will be taken against them, Mhaikar said. One such licence has already been issued to a hotel in the eastern suburbs under the new policy. Experts say that with the city having a scenic view of the Arabian Sea,

such laws will help in boosting tourism and will also rejuvenate the stagnant hotel industry.

There are very few rooftop hotels in the city that have an unblocked view of the coastline. These were issued licences much earlier.

A few members of the hotel association, who met senior officials in the BMC on Friday, were of the opinion that the BMC should consider charging of premium or considering

Experts say with the city having a scenic view of the Arabian Sea, such an initiative will help in boosting tourism and will also rejuvenate the stagnant hotel industry

transfer of development rights in lieu of FSI in cases where the FSI is used up.

This policy has also been designed keeping in mind a directive issued by chief minister Prithviraj Chavan on making the city more tourist-friendly.

"Harmless entertainment like having a nice family dinner on a rooftop eatery overlooking the vast expanse of the sea should be legalized," said a civic official.

Mantralaya makeover bid stuck again

Sandeep Ashar | TNN

Mumbai: The Mantralaya makeover bid appears to have hit rough waters. State officials said that the first round of negotiations with Unity Infrastructure, the lowest bidder for the project, have not been "satisfactory".

While the government has settled upon Rs 110 crore as the cost for the entire project, Unity had quoted Rs 163 crore for just one component of the project.

During negotiations, Unity is understood to have shown willingness to bring down its quote by 15-20%. The state government, however, maintained that its original estimates are "reasonably correct" and is unwilling to consider the bidder's offer. Even as negotiations with Unity are still on, senior officials in the state government are not ruling out the possibility of retendering the project.

A rebid will, however, push the project back by at least a few months. Sources said that efforts were being made to convince the bidder to further bring down its quote. Bids for the biggest component of the project were opened last month.