

4th TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

4th Technical Committee Meeting for scrutiny and appraisal of the DPR for Reconstruction of AV Mukku Sharangakkavu Road in Alappuzha District

Meeting No. 04

Date – 17th January, 2020; 11.00 am

Venue : Conference Hall, Office of the Chief Engineer, LSGD, Public Office Compound, Revenue Complex, Thiruvananthapuram . . .

AGENDA

For scrutiny and appraisal of the DPR for Reconstruction of AV Mukku Sharangakkavu Road in Alappuzha District (for submitting for AS proposal)

PRESENT

S. No	Name	Designation and Office Address
1	Rajan M V	Chief Engineer, LSGD
2	Dr. R. Ashalatha	Professor, College of Engineering, Trivandrum
3	Dr. Jaya V	Professor, College of Engineering, Trivandrum
4	Dr. Nazeer M	Professor, TKMCE, Kollam
5	Sri. Jithu Raj R	Assistant Engineer, PMU
6	Ajithkumar G S	Executive Engineer, PMU
7	Shiju Chandran	Assistant Executive Engineer, PMU
8	Sathyanath B	Assistant Executive Engineer, PMU
9	Vipin Vijayan	Finance Officer, , PMU RKI-LSGD
10	Binod S	Assistant Engineer, PMU
11	Jiju V	Assistant Engineer, PMU

Sl.No.	Description	Action
1.1	The Chief Engineer, LSGD informed that PD, PMU has submitted the preliminary DPR for Reconstruction of AV Mukku Sharangakkavu Road in Alappuzha District for submitting for AS proposal to the Government of Kerala.	
1.2	EE, PMU explained the disastrous effect of the flood that had happened on the Calender Year 2018 and the objective behind the creation of PMU under LSGD for carrying out the works funded under RKI	
PROGRESS		
2.1	EE, PMU informed the details, present nature and conditions of the road under this proposed road. The Right of way of the road varies from 6-8 metres and carriage way 3-3.75 metres	
DISCUSSIONS		
3.1	Technical Committee enquired about the cost of Nano Technology Chemical Stabilization. PMU informed that Nano Technology is costlier than normal method	
3.2	PMU informed that on Calculating the Life Cycle Cost Analysis, the NPV for Rigid pavement is lesser than Flexible pavement. Hence, Rigid Pavement is suggested. Technical Committee enquired why no camber has been provided for Rigid pavement suggested. Technical committee suggested that Camber as per IRC standards may be provided while execution and use of screed vibrator may be thought for laying the Concrete	PMU
3.3	PMU informed the Pavement Design criteria adopted for estimate of each roads. Reconstruction of roads is considered if the Pot Hole area > 30%, field CBR value < 5%, Correction in horizontal & vertical geometry is inevitable.	
3.4	PMU informed that the Grade of concrete suggested for the pavement (Carriage way excluding shoulders) is M40. Technical Committee suggested that the estimate may be checked with providing M30 grade of concrete for pavement also.	PMU
3.5	PMU informed that the vent design for the Culvert suggested has been considered on the basis of IRC SP 13	

3.6	PMU informed that the Traffic study has been conducted in a similar road near the proposed road.	
3.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Committee enquired whether street lighting facilities are provided in the road. Technical committee opined that street lighting should be considered. • PMU informed that the provisions of Street lighting will be provided by the concerned LSGIs 	PMU
3.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Committee enquired the mode of Quality Control for the works undertaken by PMU • PMU informed that 3 tier Quality control mechanism is proposed, the 1st tier consists of quality control by the concerned PIUs, 2nd tier consists of Panel of experts who are faculties from Engineering Colleges and 3rd tier consists of quality control by the PMU, RKI-LSGD. 	
3.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Committee enquired about the method of curing proposed for Rigid Pavements. • PMU informed that Water curing is not practical and Hence, use of Curing compound is proposed. 	PMU
3.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Committee observed that earth work cutting is proposed in this road. In doing so, the finished level of the road will come below the HFL. • Technical Committee instructed PMU to re-consider this while finalising the proposal 	PMU
DECISIONS		
4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Technical Committee informed that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chevron signs should be provided. ○ Signals should be provided in both sides ○ Hazard markers should be provided in Culverts, Retaining Walls, Side Protections etc ○ Junction markings, Side road signals should be provided ➤ Technical committee iterated that all Mandatory regulatory, warning, and guide signs should be provided in the estimate ➤ Technic 	PMU

5.2	Technical committee approved DPR for Reconstruction of AV Mukku-Sharangakkavu Road in Alappuzha District for submitting for AS proposal subject to the conditions mentioned above	
	NEXT MEETING	
5.1	Next meeting will be informed in advance	


Chief Engineer