

Minutes of the Meeting of Pre-EC held on 04th July, 2013 for the proposals of the State of Chhattisgarh under PMGSY

State: Chhattisgarh

A Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee for PMGSY was held under the Chairmanship of Dr. P.K. Anand, Joint Secretary (RD) in his chamber on 04th July, 2013 at 3.00 PM to discuss the proposals sent by the State of Chhattisgarh for the new connectivity under ABB RCIP Tr-II and LSB under regular PMGSY (2013-14). The following were present in the meeting:-

Dr P K Anand	Joint Secretary, Min of Rural Development
Dr. I. K. Pateriya	Dir (Tech), NRRDA
Shri N. C. Solanki	Director (P-I), NRRDA
Shri Bhupal Nanda	Director (F&A), NRRDA
Shri Y. S. Dwivedi	Director (RC), MoRD
Sh Rakesh Kumar	Jt Dir (P-III), NRRDA
State Govt Representatives	
Sh Sudhir Agrawal	CEO, CGRRDA
Sh S K Gupta	CE CGRRDA
Sh S N Srivastava	CE CGRRDA

Proposal by the State

2. Director (Tech.) presented the proposal sent by the State as under:-

Item	ADB RCIP Tr-II			Missing Long span bridges (Regular PMGSY)	Total
	N C	U G	Long span bridges		
Value in Rs. Crores	193.05	1.42	4.72#	207.47*	406.66@
No. of Roads	134	2	5	106	136 Roads 111 Bridges
Length in Km/m	437.39	3.67	264.00 m	6973.57 m	441.06 km
Av. Cost in Lakhs / Km	44.13	38.59	1.78 lakh per m	2.98 lakh per m	92.2
No. of Habitations	0 of 1000+ 68 of 500+ 90 of 250+	-	-	-	0 of 1000+, 70 of 500+, 90 of 250+,

MoRD Share = Rs 2.50 crs

State Share = Rs 2.22crs

* MoRD Share = Rs 153.47 crs

State Share = Rs 54.00crs

@ MoRD Share = Rs 350.44crs

State Share =Rs 56.22 crs

3. Habitations details on OMMAS:

Though the State has entered the habitations details on OMMAS, the updation has not been carried to include the left-out habitations, habitations connected under State schemes etc. JS asked

the State update the status on OMMAS in consultation with Director (Tech) and send the reconciled details duly tallied with OMMAS before sending brief for EC.

4. Balance length to be cleared to complete new connectivity in the State:

JS asked the State to send the abstract of balance length of new connectivity yet to be sanctioned excluding the present proposal duly signed and its road-wise details in soft copy for reference before sending brief for EC.

5. Updating Proposal and Progress Modules on OMMAS:

JS asked the State to update the Proposal and Progress Modules on OMMAS and send the MPR as per OMMAS data alongwith the brief of EC.

6. Completion Plan:

JS observed that the actual achievement by the State is only about 63% compared to completion plan sent by the State in July, 2012, and asked the State to send realistic month-wise completion plan alongwith brief for EC, and expedite completion.

7. Verification of Bridge estimates by the Chief Engineer/SEs:

JS advised the State that all the bridge DPRs should be verified by the STA/SE or by CE and they suggest to the PIUs if any improvements or corrections required.

8. 5-year Maintenance component in the proposal:

JS and Dir (P-I) asked the State to increase the maintenance component in the proposal from 6.86% to at least 9%, to which the State agreed to.

9. Dropping of roads:

JS asked the State to send all cases of dropping to the NRRDA and attach its Statement with brief for EC.

10. Compliance of DPR issues:

Director (Tech) brought out some issues with regard to DPRs sent by the State (Annexure). Secretary asked the State to comply with the observations before sending brief for EC.

11. Implementation and executional capacity of the State:

The State has engaged 19 PIUs in IAP districts and 14 PIUs in the Non-IAP districts. Considering capacity of each PIU as Rs. 50 crore in Non-IAP districts and Rs. 75 crore in IAP

districts, the current capacity of the State to handle the work load is Rs. 2,125 crore. The State is already having projects work load of Rs. 2,200 crore in hand to be completed considering savings of Rs. 600 cr in previous Phases. Hence to execute additional projects it requires to enhance its implementation capacity.

JS asked to send the PIU-wise work-load for IAP/ non-IAP after considering the present proposal and its strategy to handle the workload efficiently.

12. Quality assurance by the State:

Dir (P-III) brought out that the quality assurance by the State is in bad shape. As per PMGSY guidelines, each work should be inspected at least three times by the SQMs but on average it is being inspected only once. Though the State has engaged 24 SQMs, they are not being fully utilised. During the previous financial years 2011-12 and 2012-13, the NQMs have reported Unsatisfactory works of 19% and 23% respectively for completed and ongoing works inspected by them which is on the high side.

JS asked the State to send the SQM inspection programme for the works in hand and its plan to institutionalise the second tier quality monitoring in selected districts.

13. Finance and accounts issues:

Director (F&A) brought out the accounts issues. The State agreed to address these issues and send status alongwith the brief for EC.

14. Final Bill payments and financial closure of projects:

The State also agreed to concentrate on the clearance of pending Final bills of the contractors and financially close the works on the OMMAS.

Compliance status of issues in Clearance letter dated 07th Feb, 2013

JS asked the State to send the Status of compliance of issues in Clearance letter dated 13th March, 2013 alongwith the brief for EC.

15. Utilisation of Marginal Material in road construction:

The State is having large resources of Marginal materials like iron slag, Fly ash etc. which can be utilised in the road construction. JS advised that the State should bring some proposals for the same.

The meeting ended with thanks to the Chair.

The DPR issues to be complied by the State of Chhattisgarh for the proposals discussed in the pre-EC meeting held on 04th July, 2013:

- a) Carriageway 3.75m needs to be reduced to 3.00m as motorized traffic less than 100.
- b) In certain proposals the provision of earth work is on higher side.
- c) Gravel shoulders should be replaced with earthen shoulder.
- d) The provision of 75mm RCC wearing coat on 1.50m small slab culvert should be replaced by bituminous surface.
- e) In some proposals provision of scarifying existing bituminous/Granular surface has been taken in cost estimate. The value /credit of existing pavement have not been taken in cost estimate. Moreover, the proposal should be taken up gradation category.
- f) In case of multiple span bridge proposal, the span arrangement is approx of 10 to 15 m. For example 14 nos spans of 12 m each with open foundation and super structure of RCC slab has been designed for a span of 168 m. Providing Girders with 24 m span would have the following advantages.
 - (i) Due to less obstruction to waterway there will be less afflux and scour depth will be less.
 - (ii) The work of foundation for Substructure will be reduced by 50% and thereby reducing the uncertainty.
 - (iii) Design would be more economical .
- g) Approach slab provisioned is for 5.0 m whereas it should be 3.5 m.
- h) TBM has been considered at the top of the road, whereas some permanent pillar should be constructed , because all the levels are to be checked with this during execution.
- i) Flexible apron on the U/S provisioned is for 4.0 m, it should be reduced to 3.0 m as per IRC 89 clause 10.2.4.1
- j) Curtain wall provisioned on the U/S for a length of 2.5 m , it should be reduced to 2.0 m as per IRC 89 Clause 10.2.3
- k) The top of flooring is provisioned at 172 mm below the lowest bed level, it should be kept 300mm below the lowest bed level as per IRC 89 Clause 10.2.2.1
- l) In some bridge proposals no sub soil investigation (SSI) carried out.
- m) In certain proposals the provision of rigid pavement should be replaced by flexible pavement on either side of bridge proper.
- n) No proposals under R& D proposed in the current proposals.
- o) Soft copy in DVD form for current proposals not submitted.
- p) Missing bridges sample DPR received on 01 July 13 are still under scrutiny at NRRDA. and observation conveyed to State Representatives.