No-P.17024/4(5)/2018-RC (FMS-358389)

Government of India

Ministry of Rural Development

Department of Rural Development

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi Dated the 13th July, 2018

Sub: Pre-Empowered Committee Meeting to discuss the project proposals of the State of Bihar for Road Connectivity Project in Left Wing Extremism Affected Areas, Batch-I, 2018-19 -reg.

A copy of the Minutes of the Pre-Empowered Committee Meeting held on 9th July, 2018 at 11:30 AM to discuss the project proposals to the State of Bihar for Road Connectivity Project in Left Wing Extremism Affected Areas, Batch-I, 2018-19 is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action.

M ann

(Lalit Kumar)

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India

Tel. No. 23386378

Distribution:

X. Shri Amrit Lal Meena, IAS, Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Vishveshwaraiya Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna-800015.

C2. The Nodal Officer (RCPLWEA), Road Construction Department, -137843/18-1 Govt. of Bihar, Vishveshwaraiya Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna-800015.

3. Shri Rajeev Kumar, Director (LWEO-II), Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, New Delhi-110001.

4. All Directors in NRIDA

368785/18 to (2)

Copy to:-

—PPS to JS(RC) _ (3)



Minutes of the Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee held on 9.7. 2018 for the proposals of State of Bihar under RCPLWE Batch-I (2018-19)

A Meeting of the Pre- Empowered Committee for PMGSY was held under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary (RC) in her Chamber on **9**th **July, 2018 at 11.30 AM** to discuss the project proposals from the State Govt. of Bihar under RCPLWE Batch I (2018-19). The following officers were present in the meeting:

Ms. Alka Upadhayaya	Joint Secretary(RC), MoRD & DG NRRDA			
Dr. Surabhi Rai	Deputy Secretary(RC), MoRD			
Shri. T Mohansundaram	JD(Technical) NRIDA			
Represe	ntatives from MHA			
Shri. Rajeev Kumar	Director (LWE), MHA			
State Govt. Re	presentatives and Othe	rs	. 41.1	
Shri. Alok Kumar	Joint Secretary, Department, Bihar	Road	Construction	
Shri. Avinash Kumar	Liaison Officer, Department, Bihar	Road	Construction	

At the outset the JS(RC) requested that funds for the RCPLWE project should be made available to the Ministry of Rural Development by MHA. MHA responded that the process for provision of funds for the particular project is on and would be resolved very soon.

Proposal by the State

Out of the 60 roads originally recommended by Ministry of Home Affairs , State of Bihar informed that 10 roads have been the state has proposed 13 roads of $183.9~\rm km$ in the current proposal. These roads were already approved by the IMEC.

Items	Up-gradation R oads	LSBs	Total
Value in Rs Crore	200.86	148.03	348.89
No. of works	13	40	13 roads, 40 LSBs
Length in K	183.9	2729.78	183.90 Kms road 2729.78 m LSBs
Avg. Cost/k m (Rs. Lakhs)	109.22	5.42	

*MoRD Share: Rs. 170.29 Crores
State Share: Rs. 178.60 Crores

Issues discussed:

- Costs: It was generally observed that the costs for Bihar was much higher than the costs for other states. The Pre Empowered Committee was of the opinion that Bihar proposals needs to be rationalised as the costs are very much above that of the other states. Average cost/Km of roads is on higher side when compared to previous batches/State average. Since the earlier sanction of RCPLWE was concurred just 3 months earlier such a difference in the cost was not acceptable to the Pre Empowered Committee. A detailed analysis of the district wise average costs revealed very high costs in the districts of Jamui, Muzaffarpur and Aurangabad. Even after removing the State cost of utility shifting in Jamui the average cost was 135 lakhs per km which is much on the higher side. More over DPR examination showed that the road is in good condition and the state has made provision for 100mm thickness of GSB in 3.5m width. No credit was given to the existing crust. State was asked to relook at the entire DPR and rationalize the requirement and cost. With regard to Muzaffarpur MHA informed that Mazaffarpur was now taken off the list of worst affected LWE areas. After due deliberations it was decided that this single proposal would be allowed for the district. However, the cost of Rs. 122.65 lakhs/km was not accepted by the Pre EC. State was asked to relook into the proposals.
- Traffic data: All the roads have been designed with 2 MSA traffic using IRC 37-2002 which is not justified by the state. It seems that the state has overestimated the traffic data and Third party traffic verification against the provisions of IRC guidelines (Clause 3.4.1 (iv)) and para 7.6 (ii) of PMGSY-II guidelines have not been done. The present traffic data cannot be accepted in the absence of third party traffic verification.
- **Bridges:** Additional state share should be provided for the bridges proposed with more than 8.40 m width as per guidelines. Additional state share should be provided for the bridges proposed with length more than 100 m as per PMGSY guidelines. Joint inspection reports for bridge sites for LSBs need to be provided by the state.
- **State share:** For 3 Roads proposed with 7 m carriageway width, the additional cost beyond 5.50 m width should come from State share as per RCPLWE guidelines.
- Other Lacunae in DPRS: Black and white photographs attached with the DPR, which do not carry any meaning. The high quantities of earthwork proposed is not justified and has to be rationalised by the state. Tack coat proposed over Prime coat needs to be deleted as per circular dated 23.03.2018. Authenticated soil exploration test details may be attached with the DPRs.

- Maintenance: Maintenance costs of 8.61% in the 5 year period was accepted. The maintenance cost of 12.65% in the 6th year renewal cost was not accepted. State was asked to do some inflation indexing of costs to arrive at a more realistic figure which should have been around 15 to 20%. The state was also instructed that the 6th year renewal cost should be accompanied by another 5 year renewal period.
- R&D Proposals: The State was asked to propose more roads under R&D Technology like plastic roads, cold mix, Cement concrete paneling etc to fulfill the conditions of the last sanction as also elucidated in the clearance letter as State must propose 86.49 Kms using Main streaming Technology and 43.25 Kms using new materials / IRC Accredited materials as per new technology initiative guidelines in the next batch to fill this gap.
- Status of progress of works and tenders: Concern was raised regarding the progress of works and the very slow tender of works. State was asked to follow the system of MPRDA where this took a very short time. Displeasure was also expressed by the MoRD and MHA officials on the extremely tardy response of the state on all communications. The State was informed that no fresh sanctions would be given unless some progress was observed on the progress of works already sanctioned.
- Finally, the state requested for trainings on Quality assurance and OMMAS. NRIDA was requested to communicate a date soon.

The meeting ended with thanks to the Chair.
