

File No.P-17024/5(1)/2019-RC (FMS-369040)

Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development
Rural Connectivity (RC) Division

Room No.463
Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 28th November, 2019

MINUTES

Sub: Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the State Government of Chhattisgarh for the 2019-20 (Batch-I) – Minutes thereon.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on **26th November, 2019 (Tuesday) at 11:00 AM** under the Chairpersonship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG (NRIDA) to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the State Government of Chhattisgarh for the year 2019-20 (Batch-I).

2. The State Government is requested to furnish compliance on the observations of the Pre-EC at the earliest for conducting the EC on time.



(Lalit Kumar)

Under Secretary (RC)

Tel: 011-23382406

Distribution:

1. Shri Subrat Sahoo, Principal Secretary, Government of Chhattisgarh, Department of Panchayat & Rural Development, Mantralaya, Indrawati Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Shri Alok Katiyar, Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chattisgarh Rural Roads Development Agency (CRRDA), Govt. of Chhattisgarh, Panchayat & Rural Development Agency, Vikas Bhawan, Civil Lines, Raipur-492001, Chattisgarh mail: cg-ceo@nic.in; cg-itno@nic.in
3. Shri A.K Rahi, Chief Engineer, CRRDA, Civil Lines, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

Copy for information to:-

PPS to Secretary (RD)/PPS to AS & FA/PPS to AS (RD)/All Director, NRIDA, New Delhi.

**PRE EC MEETING MINUTES OF CHATTISGARH FOR
PMGSY-III (BATCH-I) 2019-20.**

A Pre EC meeting was held on 26th November, 2019 in Unnati to discuss the project proposals of PMGSY-III submitted by the state of Chattisgarh. The meeting was attended by the following officials

Smt. Alka Upadhyaya	Addl. Secretary (RD) & DG (NRIDA)
Dr. Surabhi Rai	Director (RC), MoRD
Shri B.C. Pradhan	Director (Tech), NRRDA
Shri Uttam Kumar	Director (P-III), NRRDA
Shri P. Mohansundram	JD (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Satendra Prasad	JD (P-I)
Shri Harsh Nisar	Young Engg., NRIDA
Ms. Tanupreet Kaur	DD (P-I), NRIDA
State Govt. Representatives:	
Shri Alok Katiyar	CEO, CGRRDA
Shri Arvind Kumar Rahi	Chief Engg., CGRRDA
Shri Ramkaran Shukla	FC,CGRRDA
Shri Rajesh Kumar	SE & ITNO, CGRRDA
Shri Sanjay Sharma	SE (Bilaspur), CGRRDA
Shri Pradeep Sharma	SE (Rajnandgaon), CGRRDA
Shri Balwant Patel	EE, CGRRDA

2. The details of the proposals submitted by the state is as given below

Item	Proposal dated 25.11.2019(PMGSY - III)		
	Upgradation	LSBs	Total
Value in Rs Crores	1987.25	23.20	2010.45 Crore**
No. of Road Works	207	12	207 Roads + 12 LSBs
Length in Km	2276.32	770 m	2276.32 Km roads + 770 m LSBs
Average cost per km/m (Rs. In Lakhs)	87.30* lakh/km	3.01 lakh/m	

**MoRD Share : Rs 1206.27 Crores

State Share : Rs 804.18 Crores

#State target for PMGSY-III: 5612 km

* Average cost Rs 86.87 lakh/km i.e after deducting cost towards utility shifting.

3. DPR and other issues

a. At the outset it was seen that the costs proposed by the state at Rs. 87.30 lakhs per kilometer are on the higher side. All roads are of 5.50 m width except 4 nos of roads of 38.4 km State was asked to relook into the necessity of proposing roads of 5.5m width as well as to **submit a third party traffic verification for these roads.** (Action Point: State Government)

b. State has added Rs 9.73 Crore towards the cost of Utility shifting in Total cost and the same to be borne by the state . (Action Point: State Government)

c. . Regarding trace maps and selection of roads the following observations were made

1. It was observed that higher priority roads have been skipped while proposing roads in many Blocks. The Pre EC directed the State to revise the proposal duly following the order of priority in the OMMAS generated CUCPL. Further, the following is discussed based on sample scrutiny. Blocks where priority is not being met may be removed from Batch-I.

District	Block	Eligible Higher Priority Roads Skipped
Bilaspur	Masturi	Proposed roads are at 4 th , 7 th and 10 th position in the priority.
Kawardha	Bodla	Proposed roads are at 2 nd and 4 th position in the priority.
Balarampur	Ramchandrapur	Proposed road is at 5 th position.

It was observed that about 36% roads proposed have Trace Map rank greater than 15, which shows the State has not followed the order of priority as per OMMAS generated CUCPL.

2. In Kawardha district, Bodla block proposed road T04 comprises of Trace Map Ranks 156 and 180. SRRDA is directed to provide the following:

- KML file marking the proposed route
- Copy of axle load survey conducted
- Report by SQC regarding the importance of the route being proposed

3. It was observed proposals from Blocks where PCI hasn't been finalized yet were received. Proposals should only based on CUCPL as generated by OMMAS and the same can be generated only after PCI has been finalized. SRRDA is urged to complete the PCI finalization for the Blocks. In the future, proposals of road and DPRs should be only prepared after referring the approved CUCPL list as generated by OMMAS.

Further, while inspecting candidate roads, in some blocks components roads selected were not connected to each other i.e. candidate road proposed is not continuous. Some of the examples for this includes MRL07 of Tilda block from Raipur district and T01 of Takhatpur block from Bilaspur district. The state must ensure that candidate roads identified are not having such issues and existing such issues are rectified.

e. On the current proposal the DPR of Bandhabazar to Amatola was examine and the following observations made

- 100 m chainage photographs are missing for some chainages.
- From photographs, the traffic is seen over estimated.
- 5% extra (lumpsum) is added for low lying areas in earth work filling which needs to be deleted and actual requirement based on L-Section and X-Section may be incorporated.
- Quantity of cutting/filling is not justified by X-section .
- Granular sub-base for chainage 5900m to 7900m is having width 5.70m indicating as new construction for this portion i.e complete construction from GSB layer, although there is an existing PWD road. This needs to be rectified considering the existing pavement composition.
- In case of upgradation of existing PMGSY roads the entire existing crust has been considered as GSB. This needs to be corrected taking into the design requirement, so that the part of WBM layer can be considered as base layer.
- Protection work is not justified at chainages 4400m to 4550m & chainage 8450m to 8570m
- CC Drains at chainage 1500 to 1600m, 3500 to 3700m, 7700 to 8000m not required as road lies in open area.
- Transect walk photographs (minimum 10) are not attached with DPRs.
- Authenticated soil test results showing Gradation, MDD, LL, PI and test results for GSB materials are not attached with the DPR. **(Action Point: State Government)**

f. State needs to provide MP-I, MP-II & MP-III and Mandatory certificates duly signed by the competent authority. **(Action Point: State Government)**

4. Physical Progress of works

a. The very slow pace of works with an achievement of only 246 km in the current year was pointed out as a major cause of concern.

b. It was seen that the state has a balance of 3708 kms (PMGSY-I) and 191.51 (PMGSY-II) and 1188 habitations (PMGSY-I and 100-249) to be connected. State was asked to expedite the execution of these works **(Action Point: State Government)**

5. Maintenance Issues

a. State was asked to look into the issue of reduction in maintenance expenditure in the last two years and also ensure upload of Maintenance Renewal Length on OMMAS. **(Action Point: State Government)**

b. State was asked to fully roll out E-Marg by the 1st of December. It was brought before the Committee that due to certain technical issues the roll out has been delayed. The IT team was asked to resolve the issue at the earliest **(Action Point: IT team, NRIDA)**

6. Finance issues

a. Issue of expired Bank guarantee and tax deducted which has not been recovered by the state in case of Programme fund and adverse balances in administrative fund and maintenance fund was raised before the committee. State government was asked to look into the same (**Action Point: State Government**)

b. State was asked to send their proposal for Programme and Administrative funds (**Action Point: State Government**)

The meeting ended with thanks to the chair.
