



No. P. 17024/5/2014-RC  
Government of India  
Ministry of Rural Development  
Department of Rural Development  
(RC Division)

Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi  
Dated the 16<sup>th</sup> December 2014

**Sub: Minutes of the Meeting of Pre-EC held on 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2014 for the proposals of the State of Chhattisgarh under PMGSY-reg.**

A copy of Minutes of the Pre-EmPOWERed Committee for PMGSY held on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2014, at 1:00 PM under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development in his chamber to discuss the proposals from the State of Chhattisgarh for the new connectivity under Regular PMGSY Batch I (2014-15) is forwarded for necessary action.

Encl: As above

  
(Bhim Prakash)

Under Secretary to the Government of India  
Tele No:- 011-23382406

Distribution:

- (i) Shri M.K.Raut, Principal Secretary, Panchayat & Rural Development Department, Government of Chhattisgarh, New Mantralaya, Mahanandi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh, Raipur- 492001. — 34980/14
- (ii) Shri Sudhir Kumar Agrawal, Chief Executive Officer, Chhattisgarh Rural Road Development Agency, Civil lines, Chhattisgarh, Raipur- 492001. — 34981/14
- Copy to:- (54980/14) (54982/14) (54986/14) (54990/14)
- PS to MRD/PPS to Secretary (RD)/PSO to AS&FA/PPS to JS(RC)/ Director (RC-YSD)/Director(RC-PMK)/Director(RC-MR)/ All Directors of NRRDA.

Issued with  
Encl.  
16/12/14

**Minutes of the Meeting of Pre-EC held on 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2014 for the proposals of the State of Chhattisgarh under PMGSY**

**State: Chhattisgarh**

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee for PMGSY was held under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development in his chamber on 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2014, at 01:00 PM to discuss the proposals from the State of Chhattisgarh for the new connectivity under Regular PMGSY Batch I (2014-15). The following were present in the meeting:-

<b>Sh Rajesh Bhushan</b>	<b>Joint Secretary, Min of Rural Development</b>
Dr I K Pateriya	Dir (Tech), NRRDA
Shri N C Solanki	Dir (P-I), NRRDA
Shri Chaman Lal	Dir(P-III), NRRDA
Shri R. Basavaraja	Dir(P-II), NRRDA
Shri Y. S. Dwivedi	Director (RC), MoRD
Shri Sunil Kukreja	Joint Director (F&A), NRRDA
<b>State Govt Representatives</b>	
Shri SudhirAgrawal	CEO, CGRRDA
Shri S K Gupta	CE CGRRDA
Shri V.K. Jain	CE CGRRDA
Shri M. Yunus	FC, CGRRDA

**Proposal by the State**

2. Director (Tech.) presented the proposal sent by the State under Regular PMGSY Batch I (2014-15) as under:-

Item	No of Roads	Length (km)	Cost (lakhs)
New Connectivity	90	399.89	178.91
Upgradation	19	69.05	32.27
Stage-I	85	542.77	106.71
CC Roads	40	184.96	102.81
Bridges	66*	5940.59 mtr	154.16
Total	234 roads and 66 Bridges	1196.67 Km 5940.59 mtr	574.86

\*includes 61 bridges from the missing bridges and 05 bridges from current proposals

3. The State intimated that the proposals for connecting about 444 eligible unconnected habitations covering length of about 1500 kms are balance to be proposed in addition to present proposal.

4. JS(RC) asked the State to freeze the habitation data on OMMAS before the EC Meeting or latest by 10<sup>th</sup> January, 2015

**DPR issues:**

5. Director (Technical) brought out the various issues with regards to sample DPRs of roads and bridges submitted to NRRDA as per Annexure-I.

6. JS(RC) asked the State to comply with the observations of NRRDA and submit the proposal for only those road works for which the DPRs have been vetted and locked on OMMAS by STAs.

7. Director (Tech.) brought out that the CC road portion is on higher side in the proposal. The CEO, CGRRDA explained that CC roads have been considered in the difficult Naxal areas as these roads do not require the heavy machinery like Hot Mix Plant and Pavers. Dir(YSD) emphasised that strict quality control would be a pre-requisite if these CC roads are taken up for execution.

**Checking of bridge DPRs:**

8. JS(RC) asked the state to get all the proposed bridge sites inspected by Chief Engineer/SE and also advised to get some of the bridge sites to be visited by STAs.

9. Director (Tech) advised the State to get the DPRs of the bridges vetted from the IITs.

10. The CEO, CGRRDA informed that the State is getting the rates in the tenders as high as 25% over and above the estimated costs.

11. Director (YSD) advised the State to consider the construction of bridge-cum-bandhar, in accordance with the recent advisory issued by the Ministry on the bridges being proposed in this present proposal. The State informed that they are already constructing these kind of check dams along with bridges in Bastar areas and will be considering it in other areas also.

**Proposals under R&D /Use of marginal materials/New technology:**

12. Director (Tech) intimated that the State has included 23 roads covering length of 68 km under R&D using RCCP/ Cold Mix. JS(RC) asked the state to include at least 15% proposals using R&D /Use of marginal materials/New technology in the present proposal. Some of the technologies which have been proposed to be implemented are RCCP and Cold Mix as under:

Technology	Roads	Length in Km	Cost in Crores
RCCP	10	24.28	13.41
Cold Mix	13	44.57	10.73
Total	23	68.65	24.14

**Implementation and executional capacity of the State:**

13. The Dir(P-I) presented the execution capacity of the State as under:



Execution Capacity of the State					
#	Basis	No. of PIUs		Work Load per PIU (Rs. In Crore)	Total
1	PIU	Normal Areas	25	50	1,150
		LIVE Areas	27	75	2,025
		Total:	50		3,175
#	Basis	No. of SQMs		Capacity of a SQM to inspect work worth (Rs. In Crore)	Cost of Work (Rs. In Crore)
2	SQM	47		126	5,922

Average construction cost per km Rs. 0.42 Crore

#	Basis		Year(s)			Maximum Expenditure + 10% per year (Rs. In Crore)
			2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	
3	Expenditure (Rs. in Crore)	PMCSSY Normal	76	110	290	785
		IAP	168	171	424	
		Total:	244	281	714	

Work load required according to expenditure of Rs. 785 Crore is = Rs. 785 Cr. \* 3 = Rs. 2,355 Crore

Lowest of the above parameters = Rs. 2,355 Crore

1. According to expenditure - Rs. 785 Crore - Rs. 785 Cr. \* 1 = Rs. 785 Crore

2. According to Maintenance - Rs. 785 Crore - Rs. 785 Cr. \* 0.77 = Rs. 604 Crore

3. According to Quality - Rs. 785 Crore = Rs. 785 Cr. \* 0.52 = Rs. 408 Crore

[Capacity according to index is sum of all = Rs. 1,797 Cr.]

Balance work in Hand (31.10.2014) = Rs. 2,208 Cr. (-) Rs. 3.00 (Savings) = Rs. 2,205 Crore.

14. Dir(YSD) asked the State to send the PIU-wise strength of the technical staff (No. of SEs/EEs/AEs/JEs) and workload being handled by them including the works sanctioned under the State budget. Also the additional workload proposed against each PIU (including the present proposal), shall also be indicated.

15. JS(RC) pointed out that the capacity of the state is reduced because of the low utilisation of the maintenance funds and less number of SQM inspections carried out during the past.

16. JS(RC) asked the state to explain its strategy to handle the additional workload by the PIUs in the normal and the IAP districts separately.

#### Completion plan for the balance work:

17. JS(RC) asked the State to submit the month-wise completion plan of the balance work in hand well before the EC Meeting.

#### Post construction 5-year maintenance:

18. Director (P-I) intimated that the State has credited only Rs.2.64 crore in the maintenance account against its commitment of Rs.25.68 crore. The year-wise utilisation of the funds by the State is as under:

(Rs. in Crore)				
FINANCIAL YEAR (S)	MAINTENANCE FUNDS REQUIRED (AS PER CONTRACTS)	ACTUAL RELEASE TO SRRDA	EXPENDITURE BY SRRDA DURING THE FINANCIAL YEAR	% EXPENDITURE W.R.T FUNDS REQUIRED
2010-11	20.85	20.85	16.95	81%
2011-12	24.90	24.90	14.81	59%
2012-13	34.01	34.01	20.30	60%
2013-14	24.24	24.48	24.48	100%
2014-15 (Upto Sept. 14)	25.68	2.64	2.64	10%
Total:	129.68	106.88	79.18	

19. JS(RC) asked the State to deposit the complete amount in the maintenance head and also utilise it as per its commitment.

**Quality assurance by the State:**

20. Dir (P-III) brought out the fact that the quality assurance by the State is in an unsatisfactory status. 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 40 SQMs, they are not being fully utilised, hence there is a need to ensure effective deployment of SQMs.

**Finance and accounts issues:**

21. Jt Director (F&A) brought out the finance & accounts issues as per Annexure-II. The State agreed to address these issues and send compliance status within two weeks.

The meeting ended with thanks to the Chair.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Issues pertaining to DPRs Regular PMGSY Batch I (2014-15)

1. The average cost of upgradation is still on higher side. The State need to provide the justification for the higher cost.
2. No complete design calculation for cc pavement in provided in DPRs.
3. In some proposals no details of horizontal and vertical alignment is available and radices adopted and speed design is lesser than the requirement as per code.
4. No of CD works provided is on higher side and the slab culverts proposed can be replace by HP culverts and the no of HP culverts can be merged and minimized.
5. Protection works of toe on higher side and not justified in certain proposals in Baster, District causing increase in construction cost.
6. The observation regarding the bridge proposals are yet to be complied by the State. The state has been advised to get the bridge DPRs checked from the IIT.

## Annexure-II

## Finance and Account issues

S. N.	Issues	Comments																				
<b>I. Weaknesses in the Implementation of OMMAS</b>																						
1.	Status of completion of entries in OMMAS (R&P)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme Fund - June, 2014</li> <li>• Adhus. Fund- March, 2014</li> </ul>																				
2.	Pending Financial completion of Works status as on 26.11.2014	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Pending final bill</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003-04</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004-05</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005-06</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006-07</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007-08</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008-09</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-12</td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012-13</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>124</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Pending final bill	2003-04	4	2004-05	3	2005-06	3	2006-07	5	2007-08	9	2008-09	13	2011-12	47	2012-13	40	Total	124
Year	Pending final bill																					
2003-04	4																					
2004-05	3																					
2005-06	3																					
2006-07	5																					
2007-08	9																					
2008-09	13																					
2011-12	47																					
2012-13	40																					
Total	124																					
3.	Pendency Percentage	2.50% (Out of total 4969 physically completed works)																				
<b>II. Financial Management</b>																						
4.	Non investment of funds in FD by Bank amounting to Rs. 213.72 Crore	Loss of Interest. The Agency has stated that interest would be recovered in due course.																				
5.	Unspent balance shown in UC and Balance Sheet differ	Rs. 8.32 Crore																				
6.	Bank Account opened in favour of PII Kowya	FD amounting to Rs. 2.66 lakh booked in the account of the PII.																				
7.	TDS deducted by Bank on accrued interest	Rs. 23.77 lakh																				
<b>III. Bank Reconciliation Statement</b>																						
8.	Amount deposited in Bank but not credited in the account of the Agency	Rs. 43.98 lakh																				
9.	Bank charges	Rs. 0.18 lakh																				
10.	Leakage of Interest (Interest not credited by Bank)	Rs. 20.19 Crore. Matter is stated to be in correspondence with Bank.																				
<b>IV. Outstanding Advances</b>																						
11.	Advance to contractor name of advance not mentioned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rs. 60.53 Crore (Considered Safe)</li> <li>• Rs. 28.34 Crore (Considered unsafe)</li> </ul>																				
12.	Misc. Works advances. Detail of advance not mentioned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rs. 0.24 lakh (Considered Safe)</li> <li>• Rs. 0.22 lakh (Considered unsafe)</li> </ul>																				
13.	Outstanding DPR advance	Rs. 10.03 Crore.																				
Administrative Expenses Fund Balance Sheet was not accepted due to the following reason																						
1.	Bank Balance in BRS and Balance Sheet differ	Rs. 31.43 lakh																				
2.	Misc. advance shown in Schedule and Balance Sheet differ	Rs. 21,976 -																				
3.	Deposit Repayable shown in Schedule and Balance Sheet differ	Rs. 1.94 Crore																				
4.	Document not submitted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UC</li> <li>• Receipt and Payment Account</li> <li>• Schedule of Central Fund received from MoRD</li> </ul>																				
5.	Cheque issued by PII but entered in the Cash Book	Rs. 11,675 -																				
6.	Amount deposited in the Bank, but not recorded in the Cash Book.	Rs. 3.03 lakh																				
7.	Adverse balance under head bank	Rs. 33.71 lakh																				
8.	Interest received from Bank shown in Schedule, Banker Certificate and Schedule generated from OMMAS differ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule 12 Rs. 11,37,247</li> <li>• Banker Certificate Rs. 2.54 Crore</li> <li>• Schedule 12 Generated from OMMAS Rs. 2.86 Crore.</li> </ul>																				
9.	TDS on accrued interest	Rs. 462 -																				
10.	Income Tax not deposited in the account of the Tax Department	Rs. 0.36 lakh																				
11.	Closing and opening balance shown in the balance sheet differ																					