

No. P-17024/4(5)/2017-RC (358389)
Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development
(Rural Connectivity Division)

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi,
Dated 28th September, 2017

Subject: Minutes of Pre- Empowered Committee (Pre-EC) Meeting for Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) held at 2:30 PM on 27th September, 2017 (Wednesday) to discuss the project proposals of Road Connectivity Project in Left Wing Extremism Affected areas (RCPLWEA) of State Government of Bihar.

A copy of Minutes of Pre-EC meeting held on 27th September, 2017 to discuss the project proposals of Road Connectivity Project in Left Wing Extremism Affected area (RCPLWEA) of State Government of Bihar under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary (RC) in her Chamber, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi for information and necessary action.

Encl: as above.



(Bhim Prakash)

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India
011-23382406

Distribution:

1. ~~Shri Amrit Lal Meena~~, IAS, Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar, Vishveshwaraiya Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna-800015. - 112309/17
2. ~~Shri KC Thakur~~, Nodal Officer(RCPLWE)Road Construction Deptt, Govt. of Bihar, Vishveshwaraiya Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna-800015. - 112309/17-1
3. ~~Shri Rajeev Kumar~~, Director (LWEO-II), Ministry of Home Affairs North Block, New Delhi- 110001 - 112310/17

~~Copy for information to: PPS to JS (RC)/DS,(RC-SR)/All Directors, NRRDA~~

(293066/17)

(i)

[2 to 5]

Assessed with
encl.
29/9/17

Minutes of the Pre -Empowered Committee Meeting held on 27.09.2017 for the proposal of the RCPLWEA of the State of Bihar.

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (EC) Meeting for Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) held on 27.09.2017 at 2:30 PM to discuss the project proposals of Rural Connectivity Project in Left Wing Extremists Affected areas (RCPLWEA) of State Government of Bihar.

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Ms Alka Upadhaya | JS(RC), MoRD & DG (NRRDA) in the Chair |
| ShriI. K. Pateriya | Director (Tech.), NRRDA |
| Shri Rajeev Kumar | Director(LWEO),MHA |
| Shri Bhim Prakash | Under Secretary |
| State Govt. representatives | |
| Shri Amir Hasan | CE (N),RCD, Bihar |
| Shri Braj Kishore Prasad | Executive Engg, RCD, Muzaffarpur |
| Shri Anjani Kumar | Asstt. Engg, RCD |

Proposal by the State

The proposals sent by the State were presented by Director (Tech), NRRDA as under:

Current proposals (RCPLWE-Batch I)

| Item | Proposals as per email dated 06.09.2017 | | | Proposals as per OMMAS as on 26.09.2017 | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---------|---------------------------------|---|----------|----------------------------------|
| | Roads | Bridges | Total | Roads | Bridges | Total |
| Value in Rs. Crores | 1114.30 | - | 1114.30 | 1,389.62 | 16.79 | 1406.41* |
| No. of works | 36 | - | 36 roads | 42 | 1 | 42 roads 1 LSBs |
| Length in Km/m | 557.64 | - | 557.64 Km roads | 678.54 | 148.80 m | 678.54 Km roads 148.80 m LSBs |
| Average Cost in Lakhs / Km | 199.82 | - | | 204.80 | 11.29/m | |
| MoRD Share : Rs. 720.23 Crores | | | State Share : Rs. 686.18 Crores | | | |

State informed that total scope of RCPLWE for Bihar is 60 roads. State Officials submitted that out of 60 roads, 9 roads had been transferred to State and has 51 no. of roads of RCPLWE and one bridge left. State uploaded 49 roads on OMMAS and STA scrutinised only 42 roads and one bridge.

State was advised by JS(RC) to reduce the average cost and to look into the design of road and was directed to furnish the population-wise proposal before EC meeting. State was also advised to

Prakash

follow the IRC justification. State was advised to check the traffic loading in the area. State was advised to provide photo with design to NRRDA.

General and DPR issues

- Transect walk report and photographs are not enclosed in DPRs.
- Authenticated soil test results are not attached in DPR.
- **Average cost per Km is found to be on very higher side in almost all DPRs without due justification on technical basis.**
- 10 roads proposed with 7 m carriageway width, 31 roads proposed with 5.50 m carriageway width and 1 road proposed with 3.75m carriageway width.
- **For the roads proposed with 7 m carriageway width, the additional cost beyond 5.50 m width should come from State share as per RCPLWE guidelines.**
- **Pavements for all roads have been designed using IRC 37, which is not required for LWE area.**
- PCU per day calculated on the basis of Traffic which do not justify the provision of 5.50 m carriage way width. Traffic seems to be overestimated in almost all DPRs. For computation of design traffic, clause 3.4.1 computation of design traffic for up-gradation of existing road of SP:72-2015 should be referred.
- **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. This should be done by the states for all the roads.**
- For the overlay thickness requirement of layers clause 2.2.3 of SP:72-2015 needs to be referred.
- Road safety checklist, Score sheets and community consultation checklist etc are not attached in many DPRs.
- The CDs are replaced without justification from photographs of damaged CDs. The design drawings of CDs are not attached in DPR and also the chainage location of CDs are not mentioned in the DPRs. All culverts replaced with Slab culverts Pipe culverts may be proposed wherever possible.
- No design for protection works and cost has been included. Protection works (Retaining wall and toe wall) are provided without justification from photographs and cross section drawings.
- Provision of maintenance board needs to be included in DPR.
- For existing PCC portion, only 120 mm white topping may be provided in case CC is damaged.
- Length of Slab culvert, vented causeway, proposed bridge and box culvert portion needs to be deducted in the pavement portion to avoid duplication of quantities.

A. Singh

- Wearing coat is not required for small CD structures. BT can be provided over CD works as per clause 7.4 of IRC SP-20-2002.
- Utility shifting cost should come from additional state share. This has not been entered on OMMAS as State share.
- Traffic reflective / signage boards cost seems to be very high. Needs to be rationalised.
- Contingencies and Lump sum provisions made in the DPRs needs to be deleted. Lump sum provisions are not permitted as per PMGSY guidelines.
- Joint Inspection report of STA/CE/SE for bridge site as per format prescribed by NRRDA has not been provided.

Maintenance Issues:

Maintenance cost was on lower side and State was advised to increase maintenance cost as 6th year renewal cost.

R&D Technology

State was directed to use new technology at least 15% of total length of the road. State officials were advised to rectify and update the information on OMMAS so that it can be appraised by NRRDA.

Quality control

The State was acquainted to the quality issues and standards in the PMGSY programme. Further the state has been asked to appoint a State Quality Monitor and assign State Quality Monitors before the award of works.

Recommendations of the Committee

After due deliberations, it was decided that the State will complete the following activities before the proposals are placed before the IMEC:

- i. State would submit DPRs as per the template proposal by NRRDA.
- ii. Average cost of road works to be re-looked by the State.
- iii. Third party traffic verification will be done for all roads before the tendering of works.

It was also decided that the EC meeting would be held on 6.10.2017 to consider RCPLWE proposals.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to the Chair.

