ਵੱਲੋਂ:-

ਵਣ ਰੇਂਜ ਅਫਸਰ , ਰਈਆ

ਸੇਵਾ ਵਿਖੇ:- ਵਣ ਮੰਡਲ ਅਫਸਰ. ਅੰਮ੍ਰਿਤਸਰ।

1/2587/2021

File No.NHAI/PIU/ASR/NH-01/BLACKSPOTS/2020/825.-Part(1)



National Highways Authority of India (Ministry of Road, Transport and Highways) Punjab Division

To,

Regional Officer, RO - Chandigarh, National Highways Authority of India, Bays No. 35-38, Sector-4, Panchkula-134 112, Haryana, Ph.: (0172) 2583030

Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, 432+300 and 438+850 of NH-3 section from Amritsar to Jalandhar for Rectification of Blackspots under Priority II. -Regarding approval of project.

Ref: RO-Chandigarh submission vide E-office file no. 67231

This is with reference to aforesaid subject and submission made in E-file, vide Sir, which proposal for construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, 432+300 and 438+850 of NH-3 section from Amritsar to Jalandhar for Rectification of Blackspots was recommended for approval of Competent Authority.

- In the above context, it is informed that Competent Authority has approved the proposal. Approved total capital cost of proposal is Rs. 166.70 Cr. Details of Cost Estimate are attached as Annexure-A.
- Further, appraisal Minutes are also enclosed. It is requested to ensure compliance 3. of same.
- This is for your information and for taking further necessary action please. 4.

Yours faithfully,

Signed by Abdulla Javed (A J Azmi) Date: 04.06-2021 19:08:1 Reason: Approved

Copy to: PD, PIU, Amritsar - for information and necessary action

Harjinder Singh

Divisional Forest Officer Amritsar Forest Division

Amritsan

Annexure

	proved cost details is as under: Chainage in km	Amount (in Rs.
АР	proved cost do	20,89,97,841
	Location name 413.910 – 414.090 5.No Location name 425.835- 425.925	23,47,49 10
	125 833 42	20,72,45,403
	Khichian Flyoro (1x20 m) 428 685- 439.015	68,47,30,229
	700 Cross (11x30 m)	141,51,22,600
	Tatal Civil Cost biffing cost is taken 576 or	7,07,56,130
1	Utility Shifting Cost (utility shifting Cost	148,58,78,738
	Estimated Six	As applicable
2	shifting cost	3,96,23,433
a) b)	GST on Civil Cost Contingencies @ 2.8% of Civil Cost Escalation Charges @ 5% per annum for 1.5 years of Civil	10,61,34,196
c)	Cost Start Voors	3,53,78,065
d)	Post Maintenance Charges 2.5% for 5 Years Post Maintenance Charges 2.5% for 5 Years	166,70,14,432
3	Estimated Project Cost melasing	
	Other Costs	-
j	Cost of land acquisition	
ii	Cost of Structure Valuation	
iii	Cost of Diversion of Forest Area	
4	Total Other Costs	400 70 44 405
5	Total Capital Cost	166,70,14,432





भारतीय राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग प्राधिकरण (सछक परिवचन और राजमार्ग मत्रालय)

National Highways Authority of India

(Mimstry of Road Transport and Highways) जो-५ एन ६, सेक्टर-१६, द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-११००७६ G 5 8 6 Sector-10, Dwarks, New Delhi 110075

NHAI/PIU/ASR/NH-01/BLACKSPOTS/2020/825.-Part(1)/E-67231

Dated: 02.06.2021

OFFICE MEMORENDUM

Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, 432+300 and 438+850 of NH-3 section from Amritsar to Jalandhar for Rectification of Blackspots under Priority II. -Regarding MoM of appraisal of project by IAC.

A meeting of Internal Appraisal Committee for "Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, 432+300 and 438+850 of NH-3 section from Amritsar to Jalandhar for Rectification of Blackspots under Priority II" was held on 24.05.2021 for appraisal of subject project.

2. In this context, please find enclosed herewith copy of approved minutes of meeting for information and necessary action please.

Yours faithfully

Encl.: As above

To,

All Committee Members

Sh. R.K Pandey- Member (P), Chairman

Sh. Vishal Gupta, CGM (T), Member

Sh. B.M. Rao, CGM (F&A), Member

Sh. Akhil Khare, CGM (T) Member Secretary

Sh. R.K. Singh, Advisor (Tech), Member

Copy to:

(i) RO, Chandigarh

(ii) PD, PIU Amritsar

Cy

Divisional Forest Officer Amritsar Forest Division

Amritsar

Minutes of Meeting

Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated structure at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, Sub: Constructure at Ch. 414+000, Sub: Constructure at Ch. 414+000, Aut. Aut. Aut. Aut. Aut. Aut. Aut. Aut Sub: Construction of 6-lane Elevated Structure Amritsar to Jalandhar for 432+300 and 438+850 of NH-3 section from Amritsar to Jalandhar for Rectification of Blackspots under Priority II.

A meeting of Internal Appraisal Committee (IAC) was held on 24.05.2021 A meeting of Internal Appraisal Committee are as below at 1500 hrs for appraisal of subject project. Members of Committee are as below (Attendance in enclosed at Annexure-I):

(Attendance in elicios	: Chairman
1. Sh. R.K Pandey, Member (P) 2. Sh. Vishal Gupta, CGM (CMD) 3. Sh. B.M. Rao, CGM (F&A) 4. Sh. Akhil Khare, GM (T) 5. Sh. R.K. Singh, Advisor (Tech)	Mamher
5. Sh. R.K. Siligity	" aused and consid

The following proposal was discussed and considered in the IAC Meeting held on 24.05.2021, as mentioned below:

held on 24.03.2027	Estimated Cost
	Cr. Total Capital Cost: Rs. 168.47 Cr.

- 3.1 A presentation was done before the Committee. It was informed that the project will remove blackspots at existing road and at Grade Junction. This is for safety of road users and save travel time from Amritsar to Jalandhar.
- The committee was informed that present proposal involve construction 4 nos. of Grade separated structures of 6-lane at Ch. 414+000, 425+880, 432+300 and 438+850 with provision of service roads.
- 3.3 Existing RoW of project is 55 m available throughout the project and land acquisition is not required and subject project is to be taken up on standalone basis on EPC Mode and is for rectification of blackspots. Above locations are not MoRTH identified blackspot.
- 3.4 It was informed to Committee that out of 69 Km Amritsar-Jalandhar (Bidipur) section, Amritsar to Dhilwan 49 km was under BOT (Toll) mode which was completed under NHDP as Four lane, however due to deficiency of Concessionaire, concession agreement for this 49 km was terminated. Whereas remaining 20 km Dhilwan to Bidipur section already six lane. Under this four lane section, blackspots section was identified where accidents were frequent and affecting the safety of road user. Some Blackspots was already covered under MoRTH list, which are under development as per guidelines for carrying our rectification of MoRTH identified blackspots. Some blackspots was identified and not covered under MoRTH (st) were also decided to be taken up for development. Accordingly, under priority -I MoRTH identified blackspots was taken up. In

Harjinder Singh Divisional Forest Officer Amritsar Forest Division

priority-II, this work are proposed at four locations and balance will be rectified under priority-III.

- 3.5 Further Wildlife Clearance, Environmental Clearance and Forest Clearance are not required.
- 3.6 As per the traffic studies carried out by DPR Consultant, expected annual average daily traffic is minimum 35982 PCU (FY 2020-21) in National Highway section.
- 4. The proposed features of the project elaborated are as under:-
- 4.1 Feature of the project and Abstract of Cost is as under:

T.I I Catale of the project	
The second secon	Quantity
Description	20 m
Beas Flyover	6 X 30 m
(Ch. 413.910 - Ch. 414.090)	3 x 30 m
Khichian flyover	3 / 33
(Ch. 425.835- Ch. 425.925)	1x20 m
VUP Chouhan	
(Ch. 432.290- Ch. 432.310) Jandiala Flyover	11x30 m
(Ch. 438.685- Ch. 439.015)	6.578 km
Length including approaches	Flexible Pavement
Type of Pavement	FE m
ROW	13.156 Km (including both side)
Length of Service/Slip Road	na (Retain & Widering)
Culvert (No.)	Rs. 142.83 Cr.
Total Civil Cost	Rs. 168.47.04 Cr.
Total Capital Cost	arranged was apprised to
	i managed was applied

5.1 The location of blackspots where flyover/VUP is proposed was apprised to Committee which is as under:

Committee which is	Chainage in km
Location name	413,910 - 414.090
Boac Flyover- 6 X 30 m	425.835- 425.925
Whichian Flyover- 3 x 30 m	432.290- 432.310
VILIP Chouhan - 1x20 III	438.685- 439.015
Jandiala Flyover-11x30 m	the scheme under which

- 5.2 During the meeting, Member (P) asked about the scheme under which project is considered. It was informed that project are related to removal of blackspot and pertains to safety of road users. As project is important from road safety aspects, hence considered for appraisal, However, it was advised that safety aspects, scheme under which project is to be carried out, may before approval of project, scheme under which project may be taken up in be finalised. The Member (P) has suggested the project may be taken up in residual NHDP. Accordingly, the same is proposed to be included in Residual NHDP.
- 5.3 Further, Member (P) asked that VUE at Chouhan is provided with 1×20 m, whereas now, as per guidelines 3 spans VUP at crossing is to be provided.

Harjinder Singh

I.F.S.

Divisional Forest Officer

Amritsar Forest Division

Amritsar

feer

7

Committee was informed that the VUP is required for cross movement of traffic only, therefore, one span was sufficient at this location.

- 5.4 A Jandiala flyover of 330 m (11 x 30 m) is proposed. Economical aspects, for uniform span of 30 m needs to be checked. DPR Consultant has informed that 30m span has been taken up in the section for all structures. Moreover, the project has been taken on EPC mode, the contractor will execute the work as per their own design.
- 5.6 Further, reason for taking carriageway on the flyover as 10.50 m without paved shoulder was sought. It was informed that carriageway is considered without paved shoulder width to accommodate all facilities within the existing RoW available i.e. 55 m (without any further land acquisition). Moreover, considering provision of at grade road and small length of flyover, there is not much requirement of paved shoulder at flyover at above location. Further, proposed section is in conformity with sections already adopted and approved at preceding sections which are under development. The above deviation from manual is incorporated in schedule-D.
- 5.7 CGM (F) has asked about the centages considered for the project. It was informed that centages are considered as per MoRTH circular related to centages. Further, as per discussion, centages for maintenances charges is updated as per clause of 14.1 (i) (a) of DCA related to flexible pavement including structures for 5 years maintenance period.
- 5.8 Further, CGM (F) inquired about tolling for this work. It was informed that after completion of work, influence toll length of this works will be added in existing toll plaza which are already under operation tolling.
- 5.9 Advisor (Tech) had submitted some observations related to the project. Point-wise reply of the observations is submitted at *Annexure-II*. Advisor (Tech) suggested that suitable antiglare measures may be proposed as per clause 2.5.6 of IRC:SP-87-2019, so that total height of median crash barrier and anti-glare measure is 1.5 m. After discussion, suggestion was accepted and schedule is amended accordingly. Further suggested, at hazardous locations in the section if any, the high containment crash barrier may be provided.
- 6.1 Accordingly the cost for project workout is as under:

S.No	Location name	Chainage in km	Amount (in Rs.)
1	Beas Flyover (6 X 30 m)	413.910 - 414.090	28,89,97,841
11	Khichian Flyover (3 x 30 m)	425.835- 425.925	23,41,49,135
iii	VUP Chouhan (1x20 m)	432.290- 432.310	20,72,45,403
	Jandiala Flyover (11x30 m)	438.685- 439.015	68,47,30,229
iv		over (11x30 m)	
1	Utility Shifting Cost (utility shifting cost is taken 5% of total civil cost for estimation purpose)		141,51,22,608
			7,07,56,130

Harjinder Singh

Divisional Forest Officer Ameitsar Forest Officer Amritsar Forest Officer

Scanned with CamScanner

2	Estimated Civil Construction Cost including	148,58,78,738
2	Utility shifting cost	As applicable
a)	GST on Civil Cost	3,96,23,433
b)	Contingencies @ 2.8% of Civil Cost	
	Escalation Charges @ 5% per annum for 1.5 years of	10,61,34,196
c)	Civil Cost	3,53,78,065
d)	Post Maintenance Charges 2.5% for 5 Years	166,70,14,432
3	Estimated Project Cost including Centages	
	Other Costs	-
i	Cost of land acquisition	-
ii	Cost of Structure Valuation	-
iii	Cost of Diversion of Forest Area	_
4	Total Other Costs	166,70,14,43
5	Total Capital Cost	sampared with

- 6.2 Total civil construction cost of Rs. 141.51 Cr was compared with the normative cost and found within the limit of normative cost.
- 7. After detailed deliberations, the Committee appraised the proposal with the following details:

S.N.	Name of the Work	Civil Construction Cost: Rs. 141.51 C Civil Construction Cost including utility
	Collect det Ch 414+000, 425+880,	shifting cost: Rs. 148.58 Cr. Total Capital Cost: Rs. 166.70 Cr.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to the Chair.

a

Harjinder Singh

Divisional Forest Officer Amritsar Forest Division

Amritsar

List of participants in the PATSC meeting:

- Sh. R.K Pandey- Member (P) -In chair Sh. B.M. Rao, CGM (F&A)
- 2
- Sh. Vishal Gupta, CGM (CMD) 3
- Sh. R.K. Singh, Advisor (Tech) Sh. Akhil Khare, GM (T)-PB Sh. A.J. Azmi, DGM (T)-PB
- Sh. Sandeep Lohmaroria, Dy. Manager (T)-PB
- DPR Consultant M/s Feedback Infra Pvt, Ltd. and its team

W

Harjinder Singh VI.F.S.

Divisional Forest Officer Amritsar Forest Division

Amritsar

-201

to F

ucti

ore

Annexure-II

Pointwise reply on the observations of Advisor (Tech)

N	Observations of Adviser (Tech)	REPLY of 6-lane
	From schedule-A it is seen that the	The project is Construction of 8-1000,
1	existing Grade Separator at km.	Flavated Structure
	413.37, underpass at km 414.12,	425+880, 432+300 and 438+030 3 section from Amritsar to Jalandhar 3 section of Blackspots.
	414.49 and km. 439.100 as well as	3 section from Amritsa, under Rectification of Blackspots, under Rectification of Blackspots
	viaduct at 414.644 are having their	under Rectification of Blackspots. under Rectification of Blackspots. These at grade junctions were identified These at grade junction based on past
	width either of 4 lane standard or less	These at grade junctions were identified as black spot location based on past as black spot location based on past as black spot location based on past as black spots, it
	than 4 lane standards. Then why 6	as black spot location based on as black spot location based on a scident data. To remove blackspots, it accident data. To remove plackspots, it accident data to construct grade
	lane standard elevated structure at	accident data. To remove grade
	km 414.00, 425.88, 432.30 and	was sedded with cross sections traffic as
	432.85 proposed?	extering to the ever-increasing to Land
	If all the structure in the subject is of	Acquisition. Present traffic in the National Highway
	A lang standards, then it appears to be	Acquisition: Present traffic in the National Highton Present traffic in the National Highton Present traffic in the National Highton Section is minimum 35,982 PCU and as
	and to construct some structure of	
	c land standard Is there any chance	Section is minimum 35,982 PCU and Section is minimum 35,982 PCU and Section having more than 25,000 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section having more than 25,000 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane and 150 PCU section have been proposed as 6- lane an
	a thic section of this section of this	qualify for 6-lane standard as 6- lane
	C Luna Tif CO IIIEII O	
	I I TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PART	
		1 -1 - 000/
2		
2	Row from km 418.68 to 420.66 only.	425.880, 432.300 and
	RoW from km 418.68 to 425.68 However, the elevated structure are	425.880, 432.300 and been updated in Schedule A.
	However, the elevated structure proposed at km. 414.00, 425.88 proposed at km. 414.00, Why the Row	
	proposed at km. 414.007 432.30 and 432.85. Why the Row	t
	432.30 and 432.85. Willy the width at these elevated structures no width at these elevated structures at all elevated	d
	width at these elevated structures given. The RoW details at all elevater given. The Row details at all elevater given.	
	given. The RoW details at all of structure locations also need to b	tiele 13 refers to the
	given.	of In Schedule of Contract agreement
3	given. In Annex-1 of schedule-B at no of sche	
3	In Annex-1 of schedule but a places, article-13 has been mentioned places, article-13 of which documents.	If Schedule is updated de-
	places, article-13 has been members. but article -13 of which documents.	ne
	it is of contract agreement	t shall be the
	needs to be written.	of the design
-	needs to be written. In para 2.1 and 2.2 of Annex-1 In para 2.1 it is written the	ruling/minimum design speed to ruling/minimum design speed to Clause terrain classifications specified in Clause terrain classifications specified in Clause
4	In para 2.1 and 2.2 of Allies the schedule-B, it is written the schedule-B, it is and general feature.	terrain classifications 37 2019 For Plain
1	schedule-B, it is written geometric design and general featur geometric design speed will be as p	
1	geometric design and general to geometric design and general to as well as design speed will be as go as well as design and general to general	
	as well as design speed will as well as design speed will as clause 2.2/section-2 of IRC: SP & clause 2.2/section-2 of terrain	terrain Ruling design speed 100(km/h) while minimum design speed
	clause 2.2/section-2 of the such type of terrain 2019. But the type of terrain	
	2019. But the type of terr mentioned. As such type of terr mentioned, included in para 2.1&	ain Will 50 000
	mentioned. As such type of needs to be included in para 2.1&	2.2
	needs to be included.	-B The width of paved shoulder has been
	/other relevant paras.	The width of paved should be taken 1.5m in all sections. The same has taken 1.5m in all sections.
5	Para 2.5 of annexure shoulder should	taken 1.5m in all sections. The section been shown in TCS & PnP and mentioned
	mentions that the shoot as per sec	tion been shown in 103 a
	2.5 m/1.5m wide paved as per 37-20	in the Schedules.
	2.5 m/1.5m wide paved as per second 2.5 m/1.5m wide paved 3.5 m/1.5m wide pa	in the Schedules. Further, TCS-1 is applicable for elevated structures where the length is 300-400n
	NILIAI CIIC	the length is 300 400th
	However, NHAI (NHAI/Bharatmala/EC/DPR/2016/	1439 structures where the length is

Harjinder Singh
I.F.S.
Divisional Forest Officer
Amrittar Forest Division
Apritsar

430) dated 30.10.2019 in para 10 of Circular mentions that the width of paved and earthen shoulder and of structures will be adopted as per earlier 6 lane manual (IRC: SP-87-2013) and this manual does not provide for 2.5 m paved shoulder. As such width needs to be provided as par IRC: sp-87-2013 which is 1,5 m wide and not 2.5 m wide.

Deck configuration of 24.70 m wide for VUP, flyover and elevated structure has been proposed. This deck configuration is neither as per IRC: sp-87-2013 nor as per IRC: sp-87-2019. Reason for the same may be furnished.

TCS for structures shows 600 mm wide median with crash barrier. The height of crash barrier in median has not been shown Also the height of crash barrier adjacent to Carriageway has not been shown. Considering high truck traffic, and to prevent the vehicles to fall down from grade separated structures, will it not be better and adequate to provide high containment crash barrier at the (adjacent to end carriageway) as per fig. 3 of IRC: 5-2015 and median crash barrier as per Fig 8.03 (AASHTO Designation SGM 12) of MoRTH Guidelines expressways. Fig 8.03 enclosed for ready reference. Above the median crash barrier, suitable antiglare measures may be proposed as per clause 2.5.6 of IRC:SP-87-2019 so that total height of median crash barrier and anti glare measure is 1.5

or more and for sections of the road with heavy built up. So in order to maintain the level of service of the carriageway and to accommodate situations where there is a possibility of a vehicle break down or any other failure, extra 1 m width is added in paved shoulder, can be used for standby and parking of vehicles which will avoid any traffic bottleneck

10 MM 4444

and congestion in the future. Deck configuration of grade separated structure for VUP, flyover and elevated structure is considered as per Fig 7,8 of IRC SP -87 -2019 without paved shoulder width to accommodate all facilities within the existing available i.e. 55 m (without any further land acquisition). Deviation from manual

is incorporated in schedule-D. Break up of 24.7m deck width is: from left to right 100mm (projection beyond Crash Barrier) + 450mm (CB)+500mm (Shy distance)+10500mm (Left CW) + 500mm (Shy distance) + 600mm (Median CB) + 500mm (Shy distance) + 10500mm (Right CW) + 500mm (Shy beyond CB) = Total +450mm distance) (Projection The height of crash barrier has been

adopted as per IRC-5-2015 fig-02 pg-33. In median New Jersey Crash Barrier has been used which is of same height as of Crash Barrier adjacent to carriageway. Regarding use of high containment crash barrier, please refer to Clause- 109.6.1 Point-C which states "high containment crash barrier is provided mainly on busy railway lines, complex interchanges and other hazardous locations" hence the same has not been used.

However, at hazardous locations in the section if any, the same may be provided.

antiglare Suggestion reg. suitable measures above the median crash barrier was accepted.

> Harjinder Singh Division of Forest Officer

Amritsar Forest Division

ana