

## GOVERNMENT OF THE PUNJAB PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT BOARD (URBAN DEVELOPMENT SECTION)

## WORKING PAPER FOR PDWP

| 1. | Project Title                 | Providing and Laying Trunk Sewer from Jawad Club Chowk to<br>Chokera Disposal station Faisalabad |  |
|----|-------------------------------|--|--|
| 2. | Location                      | Faisalabad   |  |
| 3. | Sponsoring Agency             | HUD & PHE Department, Govt. of the Punjab  |  |
| 4. | Executing Agency              | Water & Sanitation Agency FDA  |  |
| 5. | Operation and<br>Maintenance  | Water & Sanitation Agency FDA  |  |
| 6  | Proposed Cost For<br>Approval | Rs.949.65 Million  |  |
| 7. | Source of Financing           | Supplementary Scheme ADP (2024-25) I.D. # 7419   |  |
| 8. | Gestation period              | 24 months till February 2027   |  |

## 9. BRIEF BACKGROUND / DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Government of Punjab has approved a comprehensive Development Package to address the longstanding sewerage challenges of Faisalabad City. The package includes a total of fourteen (14) schemes aimed at modernizing and improving the city's sewerage infrastructure. The instant scheme is part of the approved package and is integral to achieving the package's overarching goal of resolving chronic sewerage issues and ensuring sustainable urban development. The scheme is included in ADP 2024-25 (GS # 7419). The instant scheme includes the "Providing and Laying Trunk Sewer from Jawad Club Chowk to Chokera Disposal Station, Faisalabad". Furthermore, this scheme will establish a new sewerage infrastructure for Chokera Village and adjoining areas, which currently lacks sewerage infrastructure.

## 10. JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROJECT

Existing catchment area of Chokera Disposal Station is suffering from poor sanitation conditions due to overloading of existing trunk sewer. Additionally, Chokera village and adjoining areas upto Bypass Chowk lacks the availability of sewerage system. The new route of trunk sewer will distribute the flow more evenly, reducing the pressure on existing lines and mitigate the risk of flooding. The trunk sewer from Narwala Road Bypass Chowk will collect sewage from the surrounding unserved areas. By extending the sewer

network to Chokera Village, the project will provide safe and efficient wastewater disposal. This project will overall help in the improvement and modernization of the sewerage system of the project areas. A modernized sewerage system will reduce the risk of waterborne diseases and contamination of natural water bodies by minimizing pollution and improving water quality. An upgraded sewerage system safeguards ecosystems, biodiversity, and public health while contributing to climate resilience by mitigating flooding and stormwater runoff. These efforts build healthier, more sustainable, and resilient communities for present and future generations.

#### SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

- i. Laying of new trunk sewer from Jawad Club Chowk to Chokera Disposal Station
- ii. Laying of Trunk Sewer from Narwala Road Bypass Chowk, connecting with newly proposed Trunk sewer

| Sr.<br>No. | Description       | Pre-PDWP<br>Quantity (Rft) | After Pre-PDWP<br>Quantity (Rft) |
|------------|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1          | 310 mm (12") i/d  | 37,122.00                  | 41,455.72                        |
| 2          | 380 mm (15") i/d  | 1,345.00                   | 450.00                           |
| 3          | 460 mm (18") i/d  | 2,790.00                   | 377.00                           |
| 4          | 530 mm (21") i/d  | 800.00                     | 1,195.00                         |
| 5          | 610 mm (24") i/d  | -                          | 250.00                           |
| 6          | 690 mm (27") i/d  | -                          | 1,190.00                         |
| 7          | 760 mm (30") i/d  | 7450                       | 2,310.00                         |
| 8          | 840 mm (33") i/d  | -                          | -                                |
| 9          | 910 mm (36") i/d  | -                          | -                                |
| 10         | 1070 mm (42") i/d | -                          | -                                |
| 11         | 1220 mm (48") i/d | -                          | -                                |
| 12         | 1370 mm (54") i/d | -                          | -                                |
| 13         | 1520 mm (60") i/d | 3,150.00                   | -                                |
| 14         | 1680 mm (66") i/d | -                          | -                                |
| 15         | 1830 mm (72") i/d | 4540                       |                                  |
|            | Tot               | tal 57,197                 | 47,227.72                        |

iii. Development of Sewerage Network in Chokera Village

Detail of Trunk sewers and sewerage network in Chokera Village is as under:

# 11. PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

- 1. To design a new trunk sewer capable of handling the increased discharge flow due to the rapid population growth in surrounding areas, ensuring the infrastructure meets future demands.
- 2. To provide new sewerage infrastructure in unserved areas.
- 3. To eliminate sewage ponding and associated public health hazards in the project areas.

- 4. To reduce environmental pollution through the safe and systematic collection and conveyance of wastewater.
- 5. To enhance the quality of life for residents by improving sanitation facilities.
- 6. Development of Sewerage Network in Chokera Village

# 12. PROJECT COST SUMMARY

### (Rs. in million)

| Sr | Description  | Cost Before<br>Pre-PDWP | Cost After<br>Pre-PDWP | Difference | Remarks  |
|----|--|-------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|
| a) | Sewerage Network (12" - 72"<br>dia) including provision of<br>pump | 868.48                  | 866.87                 | -1.61      | 1. In updated PC-1,<br>72" dia sewer has       |
| b) | Construction of Boundary Wall<br>INCLUDING GATE                    | 3.08                    | 3.43                   | 0.35       | been replaced with 60"<br>dia sewer after pre- |
| c) | GEOTECHNICAL<br>INVESTIGATION                                      | 0                       | 0.94                   | 0.94       | PDWP for design improvement.                   |
|    | Total  | 871.56                  | 871.24                 | -0.32      | 2. The cost for                                |
|    | Add 5% PRA Tax   | 43.58                   | 43.56                  | -0.02      | Geotechnical                                   |
|    | Add 2% Contingency charges   | 17.43                   | 17.42                  | -0.01      | investigation added                            |
| i  | Add 2% Consultancy charges   | 17.43                   | 17.42                  | -0.01      |  |
|    | Grand Total  | 950                     | 949.65                 | -0.35      |  |

# 13. SECTOR ISSUES AND STRATEGY

| i.           | Sector Issues  | <ul><li>Sewerage Issues</li><li>Environmental Pollution</li></ul>   |         |                          |         |       |
|--------------|--|---|---------|--------------------------|---------|-------|
| ii.          | Sector<br>Strategy   | • The proposed project is fully aligned with the Master Plan 2018-38,<br>which emphasizes the modernization and enhancement of the<br>sewerage system to meet the growing demands of urban<br>development   |         |                          |         |       |
| <b>iii</b> . | Other Major<br>Ongoing &<br>Potential<br>Projects in the<br>Sector | <ul> <li>Providing and Laying of HDPE Forcemain from Dawood Chowk<br/>Disposal Station to Fish Farm Satyana Road, Faisalabad</li> <li>Providing and Laying of Forcemain and Development of the<br/>Sewerage System in adjacent areas of Gatti, Aslam Park, Farooq<br/>Town, Adnan Town, Bagewala Road, Azhar Town, Sufyan Town<br/>and Adjoining Areas</li> </ul> |         |                          |         |       |
| iv.          | Year-wise<br>estimates of<br>Physical                              | Items   | Year    | r wise phy<br>activities | sical   | Total |
|              | activities by  |   | 2024-25 | 2025-26                  | 2026-27 |       |
|              | main   | Sewerage Network (12" - 72" dia)  | 20%     | 60%                      | 20%     | 100%  |
|              | components as  | Construction of Boundary Wall   | 20%     | 60%                      | 20%     | 100%  |
|              | per following:   | Provision for 40 Cusec Pump   | 0%      | 100%                     | 0%      | 100%  |
|              |  | 20%   | 60%     | 20%                      | 100%    |       |
|              |  | Add 2% Contingency charges  | 20%     | 60%                      | 20%     | 100%  |
|              |  | Add 2% Consultancy charges  | 20%     | 60%                      | 20%     | 100%  |

|    | Total                            |        |                                | 20%        | 50% 20  | % 100% |
|----|----------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|------------|---------|--------|
|    |                                  |        |                                |            |         |        |
| v. | Year-wise/ (                     | Compon | ent-wise F                     | inancial P | hasing  |        |
|    | -                                | Unit   | Year wise Financial activities |            | Total   |        |
|    | Items                            |        | 2024-25                        | 2025-26    | 2026-27 | Total  |
|    | Sewerage Network (12" - 72" dia) |        | 157.16                         | 471.47     | 157.16  | 785.78 |
|    | Construction of Boundary Wall    |        | 0.69                           | 2.06       | 0.69    | 3.43   |
|    | Provision for 40 Cusec Pump      |        | -                              | 82         | -       | 82     |
|    | Total                            |        | 157.85                         | 555.53     | 157.85  | 871.21 |
|    | Add 5% PRA Tax                   |        | 8.71                           | 26.14      | 8.71    | 43.56  |
|    | Add 2% Contingency charges       |        | 3.48                           | 10.45      | 3.48    | 17.42  |
|    | Add 2% Consultancy charges       |        | 3.48                           | 10.45      | 3.48    | 17.42  |
|    | Total                            |        | 174.00                         | 602.00     | 174.00  | 950.00 |

## 14. FINANCIAL ANALYSIS:

| Financial Indicators                   | At 12% Discount Rate |
|--|----------------------|
| Present Worth of Benefits (Rs million) | 430.08               |
| Present Worth of Costs (Rs million)    | 938.46               |
| Net Present Value (Rs million)         | (508.38)             |
| B/ C Ratio                             | 0.46                 |
| FIRR (Percent)                         | 2.199                |

The results showed that project is financially viable.

### 15. ECONOMIC ANALYSIS:

| Economic Indicators                    | At 12% Discount Rate |
|--|----------------------|
| Present Worth of Benefits (Rs million) | 3881.79              |
| Present Worth of Costs (Rs million)    | 905.93               |
| Net Present Value (Rs million)         | 2975.87              |
| B/ C Ratio                             | 2.64                 |
| EIRR (Percent)                         | 36.01                |

The EIRR calculated is above the economic opportunity cost of capital (12%) in Pakistan. The results of NPV and B/C ration also proved that project is economically viable.

## (PART-B)

#### **TECHNICAL APPRAISAL**

#### 16. <u>Pre-PDWP Deliberations:</u>

Instant project was discussed in Pre-PDWP meeting held on 06.02.2025 under the Chairmanship of Member (LG/UD), P&D Board.\_The observations raised by the P&D Board and replies of sponsors are juxtaposed as under:

| Sr.<br>No. | Observations                   | Reply | Remarks of<br>Pre-PDWP |
|------------|--------------------------------|-------|------------------------|
| Α.         | Comments of UD Wing, P&D Board |       |                        |

| Sr.<br>No. | Observations  | Reply   | Remarks of<br>Pre-PDWP   |
|------------|---|---|--|
| 1.         | A bigger picture of the whole package<br>highlighting the major issues pertaining<br>to various regions of the city, should be<br>plotted on a single map for holistic<br>understanding.  | Updated maps are attached.  | Noted.   |
| 2.         | <ul> <li>As per nomenclature of the scheme trunk sewer from Jawad Chowk to Chokera disposal station has to be laid. Whereas, in the PC-I following scope has been proposed:</li> <li>a. 30" and 60" sewer lines have been proposed from bypass road to Jawad Chowk</li> <li>b. 72" sewer line has been proposed from Narwala road to Chokera disposal station via Ibrahim Town.</li> <li>c. 12" to 21" sewer network has been proposed in the Ibrahim town.</li> <li>In this regard, in prima facie it is observed that the entire project scope is not in accordance with the nomenclature of the project. The proposed route will benefit the private housing societies on the north side of Narwala road</li> <li>As per project map there is an existing trunk sewer of 30" from Jawad Chowk to Chokera disposal station. The executing agency to explain why a new trunk sewer line has been proposed in the instant project. Further, if there is requirement for replacement of the existing sever line word "replacement" should have been mention in the nomenclature. Furthermore, this replacement should made along with already existing short and straight route (3000 ft approx.). The proposed route via Ibrahim Town (4100 ft approx.) is not justifiable in this regard.</li> </ul> | There is no existing sewerage in<br>western side of Jawad Club<br>Chowk on Narwala road and this<br>area experiences permanent<br>ponding and environmental<br>hazards. Therefore, development<br>of western side is mandatory<br>along with trunk sewer. | Nomenclature<br>of the project<br>should be get<br>corrected<br>from the<br>cabinet as per<br>scope<br>included in<br>the project.<br>approval of<br>the project<br>may be<br>considered<br>subject to<br>change of<br>nomenclature<br>from cabinet. |
| 4.         | It has been observed that trunk sewer   | Updated map is attached and   | Noted.   |

| Sr.<br>No. | Observations  | Reply   | Remarks of<br>Pre-PDWP |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
|            | line will cater the discharge from<br>populated eastern side of Jawad Chowk.<br>Whereas, in the instant project, 36" and<br>60" sewer lines have been proposed on<br>the western side, where either there are<br>private housing societies or barren / vet<br>land. Sewer map of eastern side should<br>be provided for better understanding<br>and informed decision making. | details are incorporated  |                        |
| 5.         | Total population served, per capita<br>water consumption and planning<br>horizon to be provided to substantiate<br>the proposed design of the sewer lines.<br>Hydraulic statement may also be<br>provided.  | Details are incorporated  | Noted.                 |
| 6.         | In the project objectives replacement of<br>old and deteriorated is mention which<br>against the nomenclature of the<br>scheme.   | Rectified   | Noted.                 |
| 7.         | Alignment of instant project with master<br>plan of Faisalabad to be explained.<br>Master plan may be shared in this<br>regard.   | Proposed scheme is aligned with sewerage master plan of the city.                                     | Noted.                 |
| 8.         | Proper justification and project<br>objectives are not provided in PC-I.<br>Rather, generic statement related to<br>sewerage and sanitation are mentioned.<br>In this regard, executing agency should<br>provide specific justification like<br>condition and life of existing trunk<br>sewer line etc. Similarly, quantifiable<br>objectives should be mentioned.            | Incorporated  | Noted.                 |
| 9.         | Various section of PC-I including risk<br>assessment and mitigation, social and<br>environmental analysis and result based<br>management needs to be filled<br>properly. These sections should be filled  | Incorporated  | Noted.                 |
| 10.        | Provision of the 40 cusec pump at a cost of Rs. 82 million is not admissible as per project nomenclature. The provision should be justified.  | This is taken for under construction new disposal station at Chokera due to increased catchment area. | Noted.                 |

| Sr.<br>No. | Observations  | Reply   | Remarks of<br>Pre-PDWP |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
| 11.        | Rate of pump @ Rs. 82 million should<br>be supported with 3 quotations.<br>Proposed 40 cusec discharge seems<br>over estimated. The same should be<br>explained.  | Quotation attached.                           | Noted.                 |
| 12.        | Proposed design of sewer lines and<br>pump to be shared. Planning horizon<br>may also be shared.  | Incorporated                                  | Noted.                 |
| 13.        | Provision for removing of slush<br>amounting to Rs. 5.8 million to be<br>deleted/reduced as sewer lines are<br>being proposed.  | Rationalized as per actual                    | Noted.                 |
| 14.        | Disjoining and removing of old pipes<br>included in cost estimates is not<br>justifiable, as no existing sewer line/old<br>is shown in the drawings.  | Rectified.                                    | Noted.                 |
| 15.        | Significant cost of earth work (Rs. 105 million) is involved in instant project. In this regard, proposed depths of pipes to be substantiated with level sheets.  | Incorporated                                  | Noted.                 |
| 16.        | Item No. 11 of sewer network related to<br>sewer pipes RCC sewer pipes, seems to<br>be in duplication with item No. 10. The<br>same to be clarified.  | Rectified.                                    | Noted.                 |
| 17.        | Transportation of earth work with land<br>up to 5km to be reduced as there is<br>open area are in the vicinity.   | Updated as per actual.                        | Noted.                 |
| 18.        | Approximately Rs. 76 million has been<br>proposed for restoration of road. In this<br>regard, it is proposed that sewer may<br>be laid on side of road without<br>dismantling the road, map showing right<br>ways may be provided. Tuff pavers may<br>be provided on the road sides<br>accordingly. | Updated as per actual                         | Noted.                 |
| 19.        | Cost of hard barrications for diversion of traffic amounting to Rs. 9.5 million should be reduced. It salvage value may be considered   | Updated this item after taking salvage value. | Noted.                 |

| Sr.<br>No. | Observations  | Reply   | Remarks of<br>Pre-PDWP |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
| 20.        | Boundary wall cost amounting to Rs. 3 million to be justified   | This is taken for new disposal station.   | Noted.                 |
| 21.        | It has be observed that quantity of<br>crushed stone in road restoration works<br>has been over estimated. In this regard<br>in the portion of 60" to 72" sewer lines,<br>width is taken 20.5 feet and 23.5 feet<br>respectively; whereas, the excavation<br>width is 13 to 16 ft. Furthermore, the<br>thickness is also seems to be on higher<br>side.   | Rectified   | Noted.                 |
| 22.        | Thickness of asphaltic layer is only 1<br>inch. The same should be revisited.<br>Quantity of base layer of crush stone<br>should be rationalized and asphaltic<br>base course may be provided if suitable.  | Rectified   | Noted.                 |
| 23.        | What measures are taken to prevent<br>crown failures. Whether, SR cement is<br>being used in sewer pipes? Further,<br>what is the distance between proposed<br>ventilating shafts? The Administrative<br>Department should device research-<br>based measures in this regard.   | Ventilating shafts are proposed as<br>per criteria. Moreover, Epoxy<br>coating will be done on RCC pipe<br>to enhance the life.   | Noted.                 |
| В.         | Comments of Consultant (SI), P&D Be   | pard  |                        |
| 24.        | <ul> <li>Sewer map:</li> <li>1) A complete and separate map showing the existing sewerage system in green color with sizes and direction of flow marked on the plan should be included to assess the existing conditions.</li> <li>2) The plan does not explain if the proposed sewers are the replacement to the existing sewers or new sewers which should be indicated on the plan.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>1)Incorporated. A separate existing sewerage system map is also attached.</li> <li>2)In existing system, 02 nos. 72-inch sewers are joining on Jawad Club chowk and meeting in 90" manhole that is laid upto Chokera Disposal Station. 90" sewer is unable to cater the flows from both 72" sewers in peak seasons and results in overflows. Therefore, additional flow (from Jawad Club chowk side) will be carried to alternate route through 72-inch sewer by constructing a combined manhole at Jawad Club Chowk,</li> </ul> | Noted.                 |

| Sr.<br>No. | Observations   | Reply  | Remarks of<br>Pre-PDWP |
|------------|--|--|------------------------|
| -          |  | not disturbing the existing<br>arrangement. Moreover, along<br>the proposed route, provision is<br>provided for some unserved<br>areas and future connections. |                        |
|            | 3) 30" dia and 60" dia proposed sewers   | 3)As explained in point 02.  |                        |
|            | <ul> <li>have been shown on Narwala road.</li> <li>Wherefrom these sewers are collecting the waste water is not shown anywhere. The sewers contributing waste water to these sewers should be explicitly shown.</li> <li>4) In a chowk near Drug Care Formacy, the 60" sewers has been shown to be approximate to the sewers has been shown to be approximate to the sewers has been shown to be approximate to the sewers has been shown to be approximate the sewers has bee</li></ul> | 4)As explained in 02. Map is updated.  |                        |
|            | draw water from two sewers marked<br>in black whereas water from this<br>chowk is also flowing directly to the<br>Chokera disposal station. The map<br>should be corrected to explain the<br>true direction of flow.   | 5)Incorporated.  |                        |
|            | 5) The caption of the project explains<br>that the proposed trunk sewer will<br>start from Jawad Chowk and end at<br>Chokera pumping station but Jawad<br>Chowk is not mentioned anywhere in<br>the map.   | 6)12" dia is the smallest diameter<br>as per WASA criteria and ASTM<br>standards.  |                        |
|            | 6) All laterals are 12" dia and even in<br>very small streets this size has been<br>proposed. The reason for not<br>including 9" sewers in small streets<br>should be explained and appropriate<br>sizes of small sewers should be<br>proposed   | 7)Incorporated.  |                        |
|            | <ul> <li>proposed.</li> <li>7) The name of colony / muhallah where new sewers have been proposed is not mentioned.</li> </ul>  | 8)Rectified.   |                        |
|            | 8) At page-18 a provision of 1764 Rft of   |  |                        |

| Sr.<br>No. | Observations  | Reply   | Remarks of<br>Pre-PDWP |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
|            | 9" dia sewer has been made but this<br>length of sewers could not be traced<br>in the map.  |   |                        |
| 25.        | <b>Replacement of sewers:</b> On pages 4&5, it has been mentioned that the existing sewers are old and outlived which will be replaced and extension of the system will also be carried out but the map does not show any existing sewers to be replaced.   | Rectified.  | Noted.                 |
| 26.        | <ul> <li>Project design The design of the following components of the system is missing which should be included in the PC-I; <ol> <li>Population to be served by Chokera pumping station with reference to the census report and design period.</li> <li>Total quantity of sewage to be handled by the Chokera disposal works determined from the population served.</li> <li>Hydraulic statement of newly proposed sewers.</li> <li>Ultimate disposal of waste water from Chokera pumping station.</li> <li>Design of the pumping machinery of Chokera pumping station</li> </ol> </li> <li>Existing Nos of pumping units, their capacity and year of installation in Chokera disposal station and their future use.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>population is attached.</li> <li>2) Newly constructed Chokera<br/>disposal station shall have the<br/>capacity to cater 200 cusecs<br/>flow.</li> <li>3) Hydraulic statement of trunk<br/>sewers is attached.</li> <li>4) Wastewater Treatment Plant<br/>(West)</li> <li>5) Centrifugal vertical non clogging<br/>pumps are installed at chokera</li> <li>6) There are two drywells at<br/>chokera disposal station, one is<br/>old which was built in 1998 and<br/>has 6 No. of pumps. 2 pumps of<br/>40 cusecs and 4 pumps of 25<br/>cusecs. These pumps are 27<br/>years old.</li> <li>7) New dry well was built in 2024<br/>which has capacity of 6 no. of<br/>vertical pumps but only two 40<br/>cusecs pumps are installed<br/>remaining 4 slots are empty. In<br/>future total 240 cusecs pumping<br/>capacity is required at chokera.<br/>Four new pumps are required at<br/>chokera but only one is taken in<br/>this scheme due to cost<br/>constraints</li> </ul> | Noted.                 |
|            |   | 8) The flow of proposed sewerage  |                        |

| Sr.<br>No. | Observations  | Reply   | Remarks of<br>Pre-PDWP |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
|            | 8) Adequacy of the screening chamber<br>and collecting tanks in Chokera<br>disposal station after addition of the<br>proposed sewerage system.  | system was incorporated in<br>newly built screening chamber in<br>chokera disposal station.   |                        |
|            | <ul><li>9) Drawing of the Chokera pumping station including all components.</li></ul>   | <ul><li>9) Drawings of existing disposal station attached</li><li>10) New pumps will be installed in</li></ul>  |                        |
|            | 10) Where the new pumping units will be installed?  | recently built dry well.  |                        |
| 27.        | <b>Back up quantities:</b> The units of back<br>up quantities are missing. Quantities<br>without units are just numbers.  | incorporated  | Noted.                 |
| 28.        | <b>Item-2:</b> The rate of cutting pavements (Rs150 per foot) is on higher side and should be rationalized.   | incorporated  | Noted.                 |
| 29.        | <b>Item-6 on page no. 10:</b> The provision of disjointing of sewers has been made in this item but the map does not show any such sewer to be replaced in the original trench.   | incorporated  | Noted.                 |
| 30.        | <b>Item-10 &amp; 11 on page no. 10:</b><br>Different rates for same class of sewers<br>and same diameters have been applied<br>in both of these items which should be<br>justified.   | incorporated  | Noted.                 |
| 31.        | Item-17 on page no. 10: Where this PCC will be used?  | This PCC has been used in road<br>restoration. However, the<br>quantities are updated   | Noted.                 |
| 32.        | <b>Item-20 on page no. 11:</b> Sand has been provided with a thickness of 4.0 feet in a length of 19025 feet. Where this will be used and its justification should be provided.   | This quantity has been used<br>under the road. However, the<br>quantities are updated in cost<br>estimate.  | Noted.                 |
| 33.        | <b>Item-28 on page no. 11:</b> As proved<br>from the experience, the maximum life<br>of epoxy paint is 10 years beyond which<br>it peels off. Hence this will not prove<br>effective in elimination of crown failures.<br>The item should be deleted and instead<br>of that Sulphate Resisting Cement<br>should be used in the manufacture of | Sulphate Resisting Cement (SRC)<br>is used to reduce the impact of<br>sulphate content present is soil,<br>not to be used against crown<br>failure. Epoxy paint is used to<br>enhance the life of sewers. | Noted.                 |

| Sr.<br>No. | Observations   | Reply   | Remarks of<br>Pre-PDWP |
|------------|--|---|------------------------|
|            | pipes which will resist crown failures to some extent.   |   |                        |
| 34.        | <b>Item-31 &amp; 32 on page no. 11:</b> The dismantling of road includes the sub base, base and pavement which will be laid as a sub base. This should make entire quantity of the sub base and no new stone metal should be used for this purpose. The correction should be made accordingly after calculation of the materials dismantled and sub base quantity required | Incorporated.   | Noted.                 |
| 35.        | <b>Item-5 on page no. 12:</b> Why this hard barricade with RCC base and corrugated sheet is being provided through a length of 6900 Rft? Some cheaper option should be adopted as in case the MS pipes are being erected then corrugated sheets are not required.  | The corrugated sheets provide a physical barrier that can improve security. The rate of the barification is reduced from 1389.62 to 550 per Rft. The impact of corrugated sheet is only Rs 12-15 per Rft. | Noted.                 |
| 36.        | <b>Item-7 on page no. 13:</b> The lump<br>sum provision of Rs 5.0 million for<br>shifting of unforeseen services is<br>excessive. The cost should be<br>rationalized or detailed cost estimate<br>should be provided.  | The item is updated and details<br>of cost of each service will be<br>given by respective authority<br>during construction.   | Noted.                 |
| 37.        | <b>Pumping unit on page no. 13:</b><br>Instead of one No pumping unit of 40<br>cusecs will it not be better to install 2<br>pumping units of 20 cusecs each which<br>will have staggered pumping in case of<br>reduced discharge from the system?<br>The option should be considered, merits<br>and demerits studied and most feasible<br>option adopted.                  | The existing disposal station is<br>newly constructed, and only one<br>(01) of the designed pumps has<br>been taken as per requirements.  | Noted.                 |
| 38.        | Rate analysis for cutting of<br>pavement on page no. 16: The<br>length proposed to be cut in one day<br>has been taken as 100 Rft which is not<br>realistic. The cost should be rationalized<br>by increasing the length to realistic  | Incorporated in revised estimate.   | Noted.                 |

| Sr.<br>No. | Observations  | Reply   | Remarks of<br>Pre-PDWP |
|------------|---|---|------------------------|
|            | figure.   |   |                        |
| 39.        | <b>MS casing on page no. 32</b> : The thickness of MS sheet proposed (25mm) is totally unrealistic and unimaginable. Do you mean that one-inch-thick sheet will be used for this purpose? Only 6-8 mm thick sheet should be used and rate analysis and cost estimate corrected accordingly. | Rectified and updated to 12mm<br>as per previous experience of<br>similar works.      | Noted.                 |
| 40.        | <b>Item-17 on page no. 33:</b> Where this PCC will be used?   | This PCC has been used in road<br>restoration. However, the<br>quantities are updated | Noted.                 |
| 41.        | Table on page no. 41:This tableshould be completed.   | Incorporated  | Noted.                 |
| <u>Com</u> | ments of Technical Section:   |   |                        |
| 42.        | Rate analysis for N.S item may be provided.   | Attached  | Noted.                 |
| 43.        | Utility service charges taken as<br>lumpsum provision may be<br>substantiated with RD wise maps /<br>drawings   | Incorporated  | Noted.                 |
| 44.        | Master plan of city's drainage facilities<br>and disposal stations may be provided  | Provided  | Noted.                 |
| 45.        | Department may provide RD wise detail<br>for sewage pipes replacement and new<br>lying works.   | Attached  | Noted.                 |
| 46.        | Site reports surveys regarding non-<br>functional, old sewage systems may be<br>provided.   | Provided  | Noted.                 |
| 47.        | It is observed that both RCC and HDPE<br>pipes are being used in various<br>schemes. Sponsor may explain  | Provided  | Noted.                 |
| 48.        | Rs. 3 Million under boundary wall may<br>be justified with existing facility  | It is taken for under construction new disposal station                               | Noted.                 |

## 17. <u>RECOMMENDATION:</u>

Instant project is placed before PDWP at the cost of **Rs.949.65 million** for consideration & approval with nomenclature as "*Providing and Laying Trunk Sewer along Narwala Road* (Western side of Jawad Club Chowk) to Chokera Disposal station and Development of

*Sewerage system in the adjoining area of Chokera, Faisalabad*" subject to change of nomenclature from the Cabinet.