

File No. P-17024/22/2019-RC (FMS-369629)

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

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 17th January, 2020

MINUTES

Sub: Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the State Government of Rajasthan 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 **10th January, 2020 at 11:00 AM** under the Chairpersonship of Additional Secretary (RD) to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the State Government of **Rajasthan** for the year 2019-20 (Batch-I).

2. State is requested to furnish the Compliance Report on the observations made in the Pre-EC to the Ministry/NRIDA at the earliest for conducting the EC on 03.02.2020.



(AA Breekanth)
Under Secretary (RC)
Tel: 011-23070978

Distribution:-

1. Smt. Veenu Gupta, Addl. Chief Secretary, PWD, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Shri Sanjeev Mathur, CEO & CE (PMGSY), Nirman Bhawan, Jacob Road, Jaipur.
3. All Directors, NRIDA.

Copy for information to:-

PPS to Secretary (RD)/PPS to AS & FA/PPS to AS (RD)/New Delhi.

Minutes of the Pre-Empowered Committee Meeting held on 10.01.2020 for consideration of proposal of the State of Rajasthan under PMGSY-III, Batch I of 2020-21

A meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee was held on 10.01.2020 at 11.00 AM under the Chairpersonship of Addl. Secretary, Department of Rural Development & DG (NRIDA) to consider the proposal of the State of Rajasthan for PMGSY-III, Batch I of 2020-21. Following officials were present in the meeting.

Smt. Alka Upadhya	Addl. Secretary & DG(NRIDA)
Ms. Mamta	Joint Director (RC)
Dr. IK Pateriya	Director (P-II), NRIDA
Sh. Pradeep Aggarwal	Director (P-I) & P-III, NRIDA
Sh. Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Sh. Satyendra Prasad	Joint Director (NRIDA)
Sh. A.A. Sreekanth	Under Secretary (RC)
Sh. Harsh Nisar	YE(NRIDA)
Sh. Chiraag	YE(NRIDA)
Sh. Pankaj	Data Scientist, CDAC, NRIDA
State Govt. Representatives	
Sh. Sanjiv Mathur	Chief Engineer (PMGSY), PWD, Rajasthan
Sh. Kaushlendra Bhardwaj	SE, PMGSY, PWD Rajasthan
Sh. Deepak Gera	EE, PMGSY, PWD, Rajasthan
Sh. R.S. Jatolia	FA, PWD, Rajasthan
Sh. Vinay Kumar Gupta	EE, PMGSY, Rajasthan
Sh. R.K. Verma	Addl. ITNO
Sh. M.M. Singhal	SQC, PWD Rajasthan
Sh. K.K. Mishra	ITNO, Rajasthan

2. Current Proposal of the State Govt. under PMGSY-III, Batch-I of 2019-20

A presentation on the proposal submitted by the State was made by NRIDA before the Pre- Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:-

Item	Proposal (PMGSY - III) received vide email dated 09.1.2020			As per OMMAS as on 09-01-2020 (PMGSY – III)		
	Roads	LSBs	Total	Roads	LSBs	Total
Value in Rs Crores	3199.31	-	3199.31	1393.26	-	1393.26
No. of Road Works	660	-	660	298	-	298
Length in Km	5807.29	-	5807.29	2839.13	-	2839.13
Average cost per km/m (Rs. In Lakhs)	55.09	-	55.09	49.07	-	49.07

****MoRD Share: Rs 835.96 Crores, State Share: Rs 557.3 Crores, #State target for PMGSY-III: 8662 km**

- 170 proposals with 1357.69 km length having 3.75m carriage way- Av cost Rs 40.74 Lakh/Km
- 128 proposals with 1481.33 km length having 5.50m carriage way- Av cost Rs 58.31 Lakh/km

3. Average Cost

In the maximum number of proposals having traffic category greater than 2 msa and T9, provision of BM/DBM has been taken as per design requirements. But State has given provision of BM/DBM in 56 roads (416 km) where traffic category is less than T9. State should examine the same and re-analyse the provision of BM/DBM in the pavement design. Overall average cost of proposal is Rs 49.07 lakh/km which is higher in comparison to previous years.

4. Planning Related Compliances

1. For the calculation of Utility Values for the generation of CUCPL, the PIU is required to map all the indirect and direct habitations benefitted from the candidate road. Many PIUs had not mapped indirectly benefitted habitations and hence the priorities generated were not satisfactory and reflective of actual priorities as per guidelines. NRIDA has informed the same and a drive was conducted by SRRDA to get indirect habitations mapped. Post drive, NRIDA has replaced the older CUCPL with the freshly generated CUCPL which now reflects the correct priority. As the PIU had planned the DPRs based on the older CUCPL, there is a requirement to assess the DPRs vis-a-vis the new CUCPL.
2. NRIDA has prepared a list of 453 TR/MRLs which have higher priority than the lowest proposed road in the Block as per the current proposals (STA approved or entered). The PIU has to assess the additional length required for preparation of DPRs for the newly eligible roads. In case the overall target of the Block is exceeded, the PIU has to drop the lowest priority road for which DPR irrespective of preparation of DPR. Certain Blocks have more than 4 such roads each and upto 13 roads. Block-wise number of higher priority, un-excluded and un-proposed road is emailed separately. A total of 150 Blocks in 31 Districts are affected by this. Against the 453 TR/MRLs - SRRDA has to submit undertaking whether the TR/MRL will be proposed in Batch-2 and fits in the overall target provided to the Block. Further for the current batch, out of the 298 Proposals, the SRRDA also has to communicate which proposals are being dropped because of the exceeding of length to accommodate newly eligible roads.
3. Details for the exclusions of roads in CUCPL as submitted by SRRDA were found to be unsatisfactory. In total 316 exclusions were exercised in CUCPL without giving sufficient remarks i.e. details are not provided about year of sanction in state scheme, proposal in state scheme, completion dates etc. Exclusions have been deleted and need to be entered satisfactorily by the SRRDA.

4. Following roads proposed are identified as Link Routes which doesn't fall into the category of TR/MRL as required by PMGSY-III. The following roads are to be put on hold and not be proposed in Batch-I.

District	Block	Road name	Remarks
Barmer	Chohtan	MRL10-Bakhasar to Bhchchawal	Link Route being Proposed
Barmer	Chohtan	MRL05-Dhanau Surte ki Dhani	Link Route being Proposed
Barmer	Chohtan	MRL23-Bijrad Road to Sukaliya	Link Route being Proposed
Jaisalmer	Sankra (Pokaran)	MRL12-Bhikhodai to Bhanunagar	Link Route being Proposed
Bikaner	Nokha	MRL21 – Rora to Nokha Gaon	Dirt Road Leading to Mine to be dropped.
Bara	Anta	T11 - AR Baldora to Hanuman Temple	Link Route and its Candidate Road Length wrongly/deliberately entered as 5 km.
Kota	Sultanpur	T05-Budadeep to Kumla via Suraj Temple, Takawara	VR0020 (#46) is only being proposed - it's a Link Route.
Sawaimadhopur	Khandar	T23-AR to Pali	VR0026 is Linkroute which is being proposed.
Baran	Atru	T09-Piplod to Khuri via Ardand	VR0254 is Link Route and is the only part of Candidate Road being proposed.

Team from NRIDA shall visit certain roads from the above list. Notwithstanding above, the proposals are kept on hold for Batch-1 and the State should request for dropping.

5. Following roads proposed have found to be merged incorrectly ie the roads combined to make TR/MRL are not continuous in nature as per inspection of Trace Maps. The SRRDA has to inspect whether it's because of incorrect Trace Maps or the roads combined are actually discontinuous. In case of former, fresh Trace Map needs to be submitted and in case of the latter, the TR/MRL would need to be appropriately modified or deleted.

District	Block	Road name	Remarks
Dholpur	Rajakhera	T10-Dholpur Rajakhera road to Indrawali Farashpura Golipura Rehnawali Mata upto Andwapureni road	Wrongly merged with 139 rank road
Pratapgarh	Peepal Khoont	T08-T01 To Jethliya Sobhniya Teendhari Chhatri	Candidate Roads proposed are discontinuous
Bundi	Bundi	T17-NAMANA HARIPURA SHAYAMU DULEHPURA	Candidate Roads Proposed are discontinuous
Dungarpur	Sagwara	T09-Padwa Karada Gada Vasan Kariyana Road	On Trace Map, the road appears terminal and not leading to anywhere.
Jaisalmer	Sankra(Pokaran)	MRL17-Dantal to Khetasar to Phulasar via	Candidate Road of the proposed route is discontinuous

6. As discussed in the meeting, roads with proposed length less than 3 km need to be excluded from the existing proposals for Batch-I irrespective of DPR or STA approval.

7. Certain PIUs viz. Banswara, Bhilwara, Dholpur, Dungarpur, Jaipur, Karauli, Sawai Madhopur, Udaipur skipped priority without giving reason by exploiting loop hole in OMMAS. Such diversion of processes is a serious matter. SRRDA to ensure the reason for exclusions is noted in the OMMAS and ensure this is not encouraged or happens in the future.
8. For the following Blocks, the PIU was found to have mapped excess or deficit habitations against certain candidate roads. This is after the drive was completed by SRRDA. Hence, the newly generated CUCPLs are still not accurate. It's decided the NRIDA shall be deleting CUCPL for the following blocks and SRRDA official has to oversee the habitation mapping for each road in the Block and there-on request the regeneration of CUCPL.

SI No.	District	Block	Remarks
1	Jaisalmer	Pokran	Eg. T01 mapped with less number of Habitations
2	Barmer	Chottan	
3	Dholpur	Rajakhera	Eg. T22 and T01
4	Bikaner	Nokha	Eg. MRL08 has excess habitations mapped.
5	Dholpur	Dhaulpur	Eg. T01 and T15
6	Dungarpur	Sangwara	Eg. T08 has excess Habitations
7	Bikaner	Lunkaransar	MRL01 has insufficient habitations mapped

On regeneration, instructions provided in above paras regarding re-generated CUCPL and re-assessment of priorities shall hold true for these 7 blocks.

9. Further, Districts for which proposals are being brought are required to make at least one payment per district through e-MARG before sanction of Batch-I of PMGSY and accordingly prerequisites are to be completed.
10. Following observations made on DPR have been complied with by the State:
- Third Party Survey and Axle load test have been conducted for proposals with more than 1 MSA Traffic.
 - Roads which qualify for intermediate lane based on PCU consideration have been proposed with 5.50 M carriageway width.
 - In certain cases existing surface seems to be on fair conditions and BT only damaged in majority of the portion. As these roads are proposed under upgradation, pavement should be designed as per para 2.2.3 of the IRC SP: 722015. State has complied with this observation.
 - Roads proposed to be constructed using waste plastic technology, the bitumen content needs to be reduced as per the existing norms of PMGSY.

11. R&D technology

The state has proposed 1981.8 Km using Waste Plastic under Technology with IRC Specification (Mainstreaming of Technology) and 70.31 Cell filled concrete under technology with IRC Accreditation which is less than mandatory requirement of 5%. State was advised to compensate the shortfall in the next phase of the proposal.

12. Quality Control

Unsatisfactory grading in the maintenance works is on higher side of 21.05 % w.r.t to the targeted national average which needs to be reduced.

13. Maintenance Fund

The State has to propose separate maintenance head in the State Budget as pre- requisite of PMGSY III.
