



Regional Disparities of Rural Road Connectivity in Karnataka: An Analysis

Dr. Yuvaraja U

Assistant Professor, Department of Studies Economics (PG) SDM Collage (Autonomous), Ujire-574 240, Belthangadi Tq. Dakshina Kannada Dt. Karnataka, India

Dr. B Jayarama Bhat

Professor of Economics, Department of Studies in Economics, Jnanasahyadri, Shankaraghatta-577451, Shivamogga Dt. Karnataka, India

ABSTRACT

Considering the macro-economic variables, Karnataka economy has been considered to be one of the fast growing economies in the country. The state is in the fore front in GSDP growth, IT & BT services, literacy rate is also increasing, and accessibility of infrastructures is also promising. But, in respect of micro variables, we can observe wide spread disparities among the districts, sub districts and also between the regions in Karnataka. On the one side nature and on the other side man/government have created disparity in respect of economic, social, political and religious. Among those, economic disparity has been treated to be root for the other types of disparities in any economy Even with the longtime efforts of both governments on resolving disparities, Karnataka has facing several disparities between the regions. Here, the researcher has analysed the issues of regional disparities in rural road connectivity in Karnataka. The present study has been conducted based on secondary data.

KEYWORDS : Rural Road, Connectivity, PMGSY, Regional Disparity

1.1. Introduction

Based on macro-economic variables, the economy of Karnataka has been considered as one the fast growing economies in the country. As on 2015-16, it has registered about 6.2 per cent growth rate in GSDP and its per capita income at current price has also shown increasing trend, as compared to previous year, of 11 percent in 2015-16 (1.31 lakh in 2014-15 to 1.46 lakh in 2015-16). Further, Karnataka's tax –GSDP rate is the highest among the states in the country; its own tax revenue increased from Rs. 68554 crore in 2009 to Rs. 76445 crore in 2015-16. Moreover, the state is the hot destination for FDI in India; recently its FDI share is 13.22 per cent of the total inflow into India. State is pioneer of the IT revolution in India; today it is home to over 3500 IT Companies and its share in total IT export of the country is 38% in 2015-16. Bangalore is the 4th best technology hub in the world after Silicon Valley, Boston, and London. Karnataka has also been familiar for providing smart transportation among the states in the country. Based on the above macro level realities of the state, anybody could easily say that the economy of Karnataka is one of the fast growing economies in India. But when we convert all the macro variables into micro variables, it could be hard to accept the growth status of the Karnataka economy. There is a disparity among the districts in respect of Income, Precipitate income, availability of Health and education facilities, extension of IT and BT services, poverty, unemployment literacy, transportation and communication and so forth. The infrastructure condition is very critical in north Karnataka as compared to south Karnataka. Low per capita income, higher poverty, lack of sanitation, higher dependency of agriculture, low literacy rate, low life expectancy, low level industrialization, low financial inclusion, low standard of living and so forth are the collective features of most of the districts of north Karnataka and associated with the inadequate transportation system. As regards to transportation, poor quality of rural roads (means) links from village to urban center in north region creating other type of transportation problems. In north Karnataka, people highly rely on LGVs (modes) - they call it as tom-tom- for traveling from one place to another place, which incur more cost on them.

Even though the efforts of state and central governments, over the period independence, through different special programmes and schemes under five year plans, disparities among the districts and sub districts have not come under control. Among those, disparity

of rural road connectivity is considered to be one of the most threatening disparities in the state. Rural road connectivity plays a prominent role in any region for that matter, particularly in the rural areas. *Providing Urban Amenities to Rural Areas (PURA)*, is a concept developed by A P J Abdul Kalam, former President of India. It talks about four important connectivity, such are *Physical, Electronic, Knowledge and Economic Connectivity*.¹ Among those connectives, the second, third, and the fourth type of connectivity are greatly relied on *Physical Connectivity*. But here is a widespread gap between regions and among districts, both qualitative and quantitative, in respect of providing physical connectivity in Karnataka. It may be the cause of the strong backwash effect and week spread effect in Karnataka. As on 2012, in Karnataka, an average rural road length per 100 sq km was 76.37km. Among the districts, Udupi, Dakshina Kannada and Mandya districts have registered high of about 198km, 160 km and 155 km per 100 sq km. As against, the districts of Koppal (36.33), Bidar (45.26), Bellary (51.67) and Raichur (58.00) have registered below the state average of 76.37 km per 100sq km. Further, the average length of PWD roads (NHs, SHs and MDRs) per 100 sq km area was 40.02 km in 2015-16 in this respect. Among the districts, the road length per 100 sq km in Mandya district is high of 69.34 km and Kalburgi district has the lowest of 26.02 km. Further, the road length per 100 sq km in Raichur, Bidar, Vijayapura, Yadgir, Chitradurga, Bellary, Baglkote districts are below the state average. Based on the above, it can be stated that there is a widespread gap between South and North Regions regarding rural road connectivity in Karnataka.]

1.1. The Paper

The major objective of the present study is to analyse the regional imbalances of the rural road connectivity in Karnataka. Further, the study also concentrates on the division-wise and region wise and population wise physical performance of PMGSY over the period 2000 in Karnataka. The study completely relied on secondary data for its analysis. The secondary data required for the study were gathered from published sources such as various Titles, Journals, Periodicals and Reports on the subject. For the purpose of gathering the latest information on the topic, the internet websites namely www.pmgysy.ac.in and www.pmgysy.org are also consulted.

1.2. Review of Literature

Accessible literature and documentary sources helped to have

apparent knowledge about research that had been conducted in the particular area in the past. In the present study such review of literature on road transportation in general and on rural road transportation in particular have been reviewed.

Singh L.P (2009) points out that the compound annual growth rate of road length per annum in rural and urban areas increased at 4 per cent; vehicle operating cost is depending upon the condition of the roads. The author also held that financing of rural roads can, basically, carry a traffic volume of up to 25-40 vehicles per day and normal roads can carry between 100 and 1000 vehicles per day in general.² *Amith Sharma (2009)*, expressed the view that construction of rural roads in India automatically raises rural incomes and improves people's access to health and education services. Further, the study also highlights the vision 2025 of the road development³ *Anbalagan P. (2009)* had focused his eye on the functional relationship between the transport infrastructure and incidence of poverty. He has referred various empirical reviews on rural poverty reduction, for example, *Kwon (2000)* reviews that 1 per cent increase in road sector investment is associated with a 0.3 per cent drop in poverty incidence in the country, further, he found out that in good-road provinces poverty reduction is 0.33 per cent and in bad-road provinces poverty reduction incidence stood at 0.09 per cent.⁴ *Project documentation (2008)* has proved that the PMGSY is a means of increasing agriculture and other incomes by improving economic and social services in rural areas. The planning and implementation of this programme should also assess the demand, absorptive capacity, rehabilitation issues and adverse impacts of such road links.⁵

Shenggen Fan and Cannie Chan-Kang (2005) have analysed the impacts of road investments on overall economic growth, agriculture growth, urban and rural poverty reduction in China. The study also found that the low quality (mostly rural) roads were four times greater than the higher quality roads.⁶ *Dara Johnston and David Salter (2001)* were argued that systematic program of maintenance is demanding, because it includes minor repairs and improvements to eliminate the cause of defects and avoid exclusive repetition of maintenance efforts and avoiding expensive rehabilitation work⁷ *Biplab Moitra (2001)* analysed that the development of Rural Road Infrastructure will not only attract economic, industrial and tourism development activities but also enhance the quality of people's life by better connectivity. Further, he also suggested that: Adoption of appropriate and cost-effective technology using local materials, machinery and other resources is, therefore, essential for the adoption of low cost construction techniques and new technology using local Panchayaths and NGOs has a very important role in motivating people's participation in the creation and up-keep of community assets like rural link roads.⁸ *K.N. Raju (2000)* presents the scenario of rural roads in India, sources of funds, maintenance and management of rural roads⁹ *Hana G. Jacoby (1998)* argued that providing extensive road network to marketing centers, educational and health hubs and likewise centers would confer substantial benefits to people but it was not an easy task in the hilly country of Nepal¹⁰

1.4. RR Network Development under PMGSY in Karnataka

Considering the accessibility of rural road network in state, the HPCRRRI report had identified that of the total about 50 more backward taluks and 40 less backward taluks in the state of Karnataka, about 37 and 24 taluks were respectively in the Northern Karnataka and 13 and 16 taluks were in the Southern Karnataka in the year 2000¹¹. The committee recommended to give much importance, with special assistance, to develop the road network in the North Karnataka as well as deprived taluks of south Karnataka. In this respect, improvements made in such regions as regards the accessibility of the rural road network under PMGSY during the period 2000-01 to 2015-2016 are discussed as follows.

1.5. Division wise physical progress of PMGSY in Karnataka 2000-01 to 2015-16

It would be appropriate here to provide, a fairly elaborative,

population wise, division wise and region wise new connectivity status under the PMGSY (Table-01). Firstly, as on 2000, there were, totally, about 4458 unconnected habitations in Karnataka of which high of 92 per cent of unconnected habitations found registered under low population category habitations (4100 unconnected habitations - under 499 to less than 250 population group). Former revealed that earlier efforts of rural road development by state and central government were partially neglect the low population category habitations in Karnataka. Rural development is considered to be the engine for overall economic development of the state/country. Keeping this in mind, with the view of rural road development, central government has announced flagship programme viz. Pradhan Mantra Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) on 25th December 2000. During the period 2000-01 to 2015-16, about 410 (see table-03) unconnected habitations have been connected under PMGSY in Karnataka (which was 9.19 % of coverage of total unconnected habitations) of which 69.75 per cent of habitations by large population group and remaining of only 30.25 per cent from low population category habitations. Even though large proportion of unconnected habitations found registered under small population group, the PMGSY has not given the much attention to connect unconnected small population habitations in Karnataka.

Secondly, over the period 2000-01, about 7551¹² habitations have been upgraded, already existed one, under the PMGSY which was 30.26 per cent coverage of total habitations of state. It can also be evidenced from the data that PMGSY has given the much more importance to highly populated habitations for upgrading roads and partially neglect the low population habitations in state during the above said period (of the total high and low population habitations of about 21 per cent and 9 per cent of habitations upgraded respectively during the period 2000-01 to 2015-16). The same analogy holds well in all four divisions of state also (see Table-03).

1.6. Implementation Status of the PMGSY in South and North Region 2000-01 to 2015-16

In Table 02 information as regards to region-wise and population wise, north and south Karnataka, implementation status of the PMGSY is provided. As on October 2016, of the total unconnected habitations, about 410 (9.20 %) habitations have been connected under the PMGSY in Karnataka. Thus, it is evident from the data that both the North and South regions total unconnected habitations large population category habitations have been benefited more as compared to low population category habitations in this respect. Further, as on 2000 there were 3474 and 984 unconnected habitations registered in North and south region of which correspondingly about 5.23 per cent and 23.17 per cent of habitations have been newly connected under PMGSY up to 2015-16. Based on the above facts it can be stated that PMGSY has not given much importance to low population unconnected habitations in Karnataka as well as it also failed to provide new connectivity to unconnected habitations of North Karnataka during its successive 15 years of journey.

PMGSY has given much importance to upgradation of already existed one rural road network in Karnataka. Of the total habitations about 7551 habitations of road network has been upgraded over the period 2000-01 in Karnataka which is 13.32 per cent share in total. Similarly, about 14.50 and 12.83 per cent of habitations in north and south region were benefited in this respect under PMGSY during the above said period. Hence, it is astonishing to note here that of the total large habitations of both north and south region of state an average of about 21 per cent of habitations have benefited the upgradation works under PMGSY contrary only an average of 9 percent in low population habitations in this respect in the same above said period. Considering the above, it can be concluded that small population categories habitations in both the regions fairly taken less importance under PMGSY in Karnataka (see Table-02).

1.7. Accessibility of Rural Road Network in Karnataka

Rural roads are the wealth of nations, a tool for social inclusion,

economic development and environmental sustainability. The lack of rural road network and its inadequate maintenance associated with the ruthless governance and poverty. Isolation of villages has been associated with greater inadequate accessibility of rural road network and rural roads have been called "ways for communication". Earlier days, investment on rural roads was considered as agricultural sector investment. Now days, investment on rural roads not only contributed to the rural and agricultural development, but also extended its importance to resolve poverty by avoiding regional imbalances through which confirms the processes of social and economic integration. Development of rural roads brings multiple socio-economic benefits to the rural areas which form a strong base of the National economy and it is a powerful instrument for the socio-economic transformation of the villages.

Improvement of rural roads also brings social development in the form of food security, greater girls schooling, reduction of gender inequality, accessibility of the improved quality of education and health, with better enrolment and retention of teachers and medical personnel. Hence, it also brings awareness of the modern means of living like cooking, dressing, recreation so on, and infuses new ideas regarding the latest technological development in methods of farming, marketing agro-industries, and so forth. Overall, many examples are found in favor of positive economic impacts of rural roads across the country. For example, the number of kilometres of rural road per capita of population is the most significant explanation of growth and consumption in Southern China. Despite variability in returns, investments in rural roads are found to have greater economic impact than any other investment - before education, agriculture and health in Indian states in general. In rural India, roads are the major channels of transportation for carrying goods and passengers. Keeping the above in mind, since independence, our both the central and state governments have taken continuous initiative steps, through five year plans and special programmes, to develop rural road network. As a result, currently the isolation condition of the rural regions has been reduced as compared to earlier days and no one questioning such improvement also. But, by the vogue of rural road development, our governments have often neglected to keep balance of development between regions that causes for growing other forms of regional imbalance in state/country in general. Normally, we can see four types of imbalances such as inter-regional, inter-sectorial, intra-regional and intra-sectorial imbalances. Here researcher has taken case as the inter-regional imbalances of rural road network in Karnataka.

Here the researcher used the *Rural Road Access Index (RRAI)* for measuring the availability of the rural road network per lakh rural population and hundred square kilometer of geographical area of Karnataka state¹³. Based on the index, it is clear from the data (see *Table-03*) that still there is a divergence of accessibility of rural road network among the four divisions of Karnataka state. Considering the rural population and geographical area, with a minutem odification, we can see the similarity between the Kalaburagi and Mysuru divisions as well as between Belagavi and Bengaluru divisions. Former clarified that geographical area and rural population almost equally circulated in between two sets of divisions of the state. But when compared to the share of rural road network between these two sets of divisions, it could be identified disparity between the divisions of state. Statistical inferences proved that rural road network availability per lakh population and 100 sq km geographical area in Kalaburagi division was in undersize as compared to Mysore division. (out of total rural road network of state, Kalaburagi division share was only 15.51%, 282 km per lakh population and 54 km per 100 sq km contrary Mysuru division share was 30.65%, 512 km per lakh population and 104 km per 100 sq km) as on 2013. Similarly, when comparison made between the Belgavi and Bangalore division (there is a similarity of population and geographical area between these two), Belagavi division has registered moderately a higher share of rural road network per lakh population and 100 sq km of geographical area during the above said period. Based on the above discussion, it could be concluded

that there has been still divergence of availability of rural road network per lakh population and 100 sq km of geographical area among the divisions of Karnataka state (for details see the *Table-03*).

Thus, the region wise bifurcation of the state, viz. South Karnataka and North Karnataka also revealed the incidence of imbalances between the two regions in respect of growth of rural road network and availability of rural road network per lakh population and 100 sq km geographical area in between the period of 2001 and 2013. It can be viewed (see *Table-04*) that the rural road network has increased by 71 and 62 percentage points over the year 2001 in the North and South Karnataka respectively. The road length per lakh population in the North and South Karnataka has also increased over the period (225 km and 280 km in 2001 to 340 km and 443 km in 2013 respectively). Also, in respect of road length of 100 sq km per km, North Karnataka lagged behind the South part during both the periods of 2001 and 2013. With the above, it can be argued that between the years 2001 and 2013, even though the state government had given much priority to expand rural road network, compared to South Karnataka, the accessibility of the rural road network per unit of population and per unit of land area, North Karnataka region lags far behind. This calls for furthermore emphasis on road development in North Karnataka (see the *table 04*).

Conclusion

State is the place for several types of disparities, among those infrastructure related disparities, particularly transportation is the root for the other types of disparities. Therefore, there is urgent need for re-examination of pattern of the state economic development in general and rural development pattern in particular. Central and state governments with greater coordination should implement programmes (PMGSY, CMGSY and so on) for rural road development in the state, especially in backward districts, talukas and rural areas. Governments' should have to re-think about the pattern of already existed rural road development programmes in respect of resolving regional imbalances among the divisions. Hence, governments should have to give more importance to qualitative and quantitative aspects of rural road development which may enhance the public and private investment on agriculture sector, human capital. Higher growth of the agriculture sector and human resources would help in reducing other types of regional disparities in India in general and in Karnataka in particular.

¹ *Physical Connectivity* of providing better roads, transport services and quality power in rural areas, *Electronic Connectivity* by providing reliable rural communication and networks, *Knowledge Connectivity* of providing rural education and health and finally, *Economic Connectivity* that helps to realize the best value for the products and services of the rural areas.

² Paper on *Developing Rural Roads Some Policy Issues*, Kuruksheetra, Ministry of Rural Development (Monthly Journal), Vol.57. No.6 (April 2009), pp. 16-19.

³ Paper on, *Rural Roads – A Path to Rural Development*, Kuruksheetra, Vol. 57, No. 6, April 2009, pp. 8-11.

⁴ *Transport Connectivity and Poverty Reduction in India*, Indian Journal of Transport Management, Vol. 33, No. 2, April June 2009, pp. 125-141.

⁵ A project documentation on *Social Assessment of PradhanMantri Gram Sadak Yojana [PMGSY]*, Draft Final Report (Feb.2008), Vol. I, Chapter I, Documentation, FAITH Healthcare Private Limited, pp. 01-02.

⁶ Report on *Road Development, Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction in China*, The low quality roads contributed to 1.57 Yuan for agriculture GDP and 5 Yuan for rural non-farm GDP every year. See, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington DC, USA, pp 42-44.

⁷ Article on *Rural Road Investment Maintenance and Sustainability–A Case Study on the Experience in the Cambodia Province of Battambang*, See, ILO Upstream Project, Cambodia, International Labour Organization Study, May 2001, pp. 1-9.

⁸ study on *Rural Roads and Rural Transportation- A New Challenge*, See, Kurukshetra –Vol. 49 No. 5, Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi, February 2001, pp. 12-16.

⁹ Research paper, on *Rural Road Networks-Some Issues*, See, Kurukshetra -Vol.48, No.12, Sept. 2000, pp.41-43.

¹⁰ Policy Research Working Paper entitled *Access to Markets and the Benefits of Rural Roads*, Policy Research Working Paper 2028, Produced by the Policy Research Dissemination Center, Development Research Group, the World Bank, 1818 street, N.W. Washington DC-20433, pp. 1-37.

¹¹ 90 out of 175 taluks had road lengths less than the State average of 68 kms per 100 sq. kms. in the year 2000. Consequent upon finding the severance of backwardness, it could be classified the 90 backward taluks into 'more backward taluks' (50) and 'less backward taluks' (40) based on the deprived nature of roads. Backwardness of the taluks could be scaled based on the roads per lakh population and 100 sq km per road. See, HPCRRI Report (Nanjundappa Committee Regional Imbalance Report), Planning, Programme, Monitoring and Statistics Department, Government of Karnataka (www.planning.kar.nic.in.).

¹² The PMGSY had set target to upgrade about 15659.70 km length of already existed road across the state since the year 2000-01, of which about 14505.60 km length of road has been upgraded by March 2012, working out to 92.63 per cent of the target set,

¹³ Rural Population as on 2011 census, rural road network of state as on 2013

Table-03: Division-wise length of Rural Road Network in Karnataka-2013

Regions	Population (2011 census)	Area (in Sq km)	RRL-2013 (in Km)	RRL per 1 lakh population	RRL for 100 sq km)
(01)	(02)	(03)	(04)	(05)	(06)
Belagavi Division	10278825 (27.51)	54514 (28.42)	39680 (26.95)	386	73

Table.01: Division-wise Physical Progress of the PMGSY – 2001-2016

Regions	No. of Habitations			No. of Unconnected Habitations			Newly Connected Habitations Under PMGSY			Upgraded Habitations Under PMGSY		
	1000+ to 999 to 500	499 to less than 250	Total No. Of Hs	UCHs 1000+ to 999 to 500	UCHs 499 to less than 250	Total	CHs Under PMGS Over 2001 1000+ to 999 to 500	CHs Under PMGSY 499 to less than 250	Total	Upgradation Under PMGSY Over 2001 1000+ to 999 to 500	Upgradation Under PMGSY Over 2001 499 to less than 250	Total
(01)	(02)	(03)	(04)	(05)	(06)	(07)	(08)	(09)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Belagavi Division	4016 (37.82)	6601 (62.18)	10617 (100.00)	177 (05.28)	3174 (94.72)	3351 (100.00)	125 (87.41)	18 (12.59)	143 (100.00)	961 (69.08)	430 (30.92)	1391 (100.00)
Kalburgi Division	3589 (60.00)	2390 (40.00)	5979 (100.00)	27 (21.95)	96 (78.05)	123 (100.00)	20 (51.28)	19 (48.72)	39 (100.00)	732 (72.18)	282 (27.82)	1014 (100.00)
Bengaluru Division	6452 (31.29)	14165 (68.71)	20617 (100.00)	41 (16.07)	214 (83.93)	255 (100.00)	34 (61.76)	21 (38.24)	55 (100.00)	1569 (52.38)	1426 (47.62)	2995 (100.00)
Mysore Division	5430 (27.89)	14039 (72.11)	19469 (100.00)	113 (15.50)	616 (84.50)	729 (100.00)	107 (61.84)	66 (38.16)	173 (100.00)	817 (37.98)	1334 (62.02)	2151 (100.00)
Grand Total	19487 (34.37)	37195 (65.63)	56682 (100.00)	358 (08.00)	4100 (92.00)	4458 (100.00)	286 (69.75)	124 (30.25)	410 (100.00)	4079 (20.93)	3472 (99.33)	7551 (30.26)

Notes : 1) *Both New Connectivity and Upgradation works Consolidated Data.

2) Figures in brackets in column (04) are percentage in the Column No. (02) total.

3) Figures in brackets in column (05) are percentage in the Column No. (03) total.

Source: www.pmgys.nic.in, Data Downloaded as on September 9, 2016

Kalburgi Division	8088753 (21.60)	42020 (21.90)	22841 (15.51)	282	54
Bengaluru Division	10294314 (27.50)	51766 (27.00)	34681 (23.55)	337	67
Mysore Division	8807443 (23.50)	43491 (22.67)	45112 (30.65)	512	104
Karnataka Total	37469335 (100.00)	191,791 (100.00)	147213 (100.00)	393	77

Sources: 1) Economic Survey of Karnataka 2010-11, 2011,12, and 2012-13, Planning, Programme, Monitoring and Statistics Department, Government of Karnataka, 2) Districts at a Glance-2014-15 District statistical offices of All the districts

Table-04: Region-wise Rural Road Development in Karnataka, 2001-2013

(Road Length in Kms.)

Regions*	Rural Road Network (in KM)		%of Growth over 2001	Rural Road Length Per Lakh Rural Population (KM)		Road length per 100 Sq Km	
	2001*	2013**		2001	2013	2001	2013
(01)	(02)	(03)	(04)	(05)	(06)	(07)	(08)
North Karnataka	36629	62521	71	225	340	37	65
South Karnataka	52160	84692	62	280	443	53	89
Karnataka	88789	147213	66	254	393	46	77

Note : * As on 2001 census, 18642392 Rural Population and 93139Sqkm Area in South Karnataka and 16246641 Rural Population, 98652Sq kms area in North Karnataka

** As on 2011 census, 19101757 Rural Population and 95257, Sqkm Area in South Karnataka and 18367578 Rural Population, 96534 Sqkms area in North Karnataka.

Sources : 1) HPCRRI Report (Nanjundappa Committee Regional Imbalance Report), Planning, Programme, Monitoring and Statistics Department, Government of Karnataka (www.planning.kar.nic.in.). 2) Karnataka Annual Growth Report -2010, Government of Karnataka.

Table.02: Region-wise Physical Progress of the PMGSY – 2001-2016

Regions	Total No. Of Hs	Total 1000+ to 999t0 500	Total 499 to leass than 250	Total	UCHs 1000+ to 999t0 500	UCHs 499 to leass than 250	Total 08÷ 05	CHs Under PMGS Over 2001 1000+ to 999t0 500 09÷06	CHs Under PMGSY 499 to leass than 250 10÷07	Total 11÷02	Upgradati on Under PMGSY 1000+ to 999t0 12÷ 03	Upgradati on Under PMGSY 499 to leass than 250 13÷04
(01)	(02)	(03)	(04)	(05)	(06)	(07)	(08)	(09)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
North Karnataka	16596 (100.00)	7605 (45.82)	8991 (54.18)	3474 (100.00)	204 (05.88)	3270 (94.12)	182 (5.23)	145 (71.07)	37 (1.13)	2405 (14.50)	1693 (22.26)	712 (7.90)
South Karnataka	40086 (100.00)	11882 (29.65)	28204 (70.35)	984 (100.00)	154 (15.66)	830 (84.34)	228 (23.17)	141 (91.55)	87 (10.48)	5146 (12.83)	2386 (20.08)	2760 (9.80)
Grand Total	56682 (100.00)	19487 (34.37)	37195 (65.63)	4458 (100.00)	358 (08.03)	4100 (91.97)	410 (9.20)	286 (79.88)	124 (03.00)	7551 (13.32)	4079 (20.93)	3472 (9.33)

Note: 1). Figures in brackets of colum 02 to 07 indicate the percentage to total

Source: www.pmgys.nic.in, Data Downloaded as on September 9, 2016

References

- Bhaduri. S., Transport and Regional Development, Concept Publishing Company, New a. Delhi, 1992.
- Chris Donnges. et.al., Rural Road Maintenance-Sustaining the Benefits of Improved Access (SETP19), International Labour Office, Bangkok, 2007.
- HayavadanaRao (Editor) Anees. S. (Chief Editor), Mysore Gazetteer, Volume-V, Gazetteer Part-I, Bangalore, Kolar, Tumkur and Mysore, Karnataka Gazetteer Department, Bangalore, Government of Karnataka, 2011.
- HemamalaHettige., When Do Rural Roads Benefit the Poor and How?-An In-Depth Analysis Based on Case Studies, Asian Development Bank Publisher, Operations Evaluation Department, Philippines, 2006.
- Jagadish Gandhi., Dr. Abdul Kalam's Futuristic India, Deep and Deep Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2006).
- Kantharajappa. H.C., Rural Road System and Its Impact on Rural Development (Special Reference to Agriculture), M.Phil, Dissertation, Submitted to the Bangalore University, Published by Center for Rural Development Studies, Bangalore University, Jnanabharathi, Bangalore, 1998.
- KomalSingha., Rural Development, in India: Retrospect and Prospects (Edited Volume), Concept Publishing Company. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2010.
- Lewis.W.A., The Theory of Economic Growth, Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1959.
- Pandey. B.K., Rural Development: Towards Sustainability (in three Volumes), Isha Books Publisher, Delhi, 2005.
- Prasad. B.K., Rural Development: Concept Approach and Strategy, Sarup and Sons Publication, New -Delhi, 2003.
- Ramanujam.K.N., Rural Transport in India, Mittal Publications, New Delhi, 1993.
- SabitaGuha., Economics of Rural Transport, Daya Publishing House, Delhi, 1991.
- Tripathi. P.C., Rural Transport and Economic Development, S. Chand and Sons Publishers, Delhi, 1972.
- Annual Plan Reports, 2006-07 to 2015-16, Government of Karnataka.
- Economic Survey of Karnataka-2010-11 and 2014-15, Planning, Programmed Monitoring and Statistics Department, Government of Karnataka.
- GrameenSampark- A- News Letter of NRRDA, Under the Head of PMGSY, Various Issues, Published by National Rural Roads Development Agency, New Delhi.
- PMGSY Briefing Book, Ministry of Rural Development, RC Division, Government of India, February 2006.