

File No. P-17024/26/2019-RC (EFMS: 368336)

Government of India

Ministry of Rural Development

Department of Rural Development

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi

Dated the 4th September, 2019

Sub: Minutes of the Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to consider the project Proposals for Road Connectivity Project on Left Wing Extremism Area (RCPLWEA) (Batch-I, 2019-20) submitted by the State Government of Uttar Pradesh -reg.

A copy of the Minutes of the Pre Empowered Committee Meeting held on 30th August, 2019 to discuss the project Proposals for Road Connectivity Project on Left Wing Extremism Area (RCPLWEA) (Batch-I, 2019-20) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action.

M K G

(Lalit Kumar)

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India

Tel. No. -23382406

Distribution:

(i) The Principal Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1st Floor, Bappu Bhawan, Schivalaya, Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow:- 226001. — 172204/19

(ii) The Chief Engineer, Department of Rural Development, Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1st Floor, Bappu Bhawan, Schivalaya, Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow:- 226001. — 172204/19

(iii) Director (LWEO-II), Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, New Delhi. — 172205/19

Copy to:-

PPS to AS (RD)/PPS to AS& FA/PPS to JS (RC)/All Directors, NRIDA, New Delhi.

— 476035/19 to (7)

5/9/19

**MINUTES OF THE PRE EC MEETING TO CONSIDER PROJECT PROPOSALS OF
UTTAR PRADESH (RCPLWEA).**

A Pre-Empowered Committee meeting was held under the chairperson ship of DG (NRIDA) in her chamber on the 30th of August, 2019 to consider the proposals for RCPLWEA submitted by Uttar Pradesh. The officials present during the meeting were

Smt. Alka Upadhyaya	DG (NRIDA)-in-chair
Shri Rohit Kumar	Joint Secretary (RC)
Dr. Surabhi Rai	Director (RC)
Shri Pradeep Agrawal	Director (P-I), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Shri Uttam Kumar	Director (P.III), NRIDA
Shri B.C. Pradhan	Consultant, NRIDA in charge Director (Technical)
Shri Satyendra Prasad	Joint Director, NRIDA
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri Sujeet Kumar	CEO, UPRRDA
Shri. Sudhanshu Kumar Gupta	CE, UPRRDA
Shri Mohammad Noor Alam	Sr. Engineer
Shri M Murtaza	ITNO
Shri. Ramesh Chandra	EE, Sonbhadra
Shri. Vinod Kumar	JE, Sonbhadra
Shri. Santosh Kumar	JS, Sonbhadra

2. The details of current batch of proposals brought forth by the State are as follows:-

Item	Proposals as per letter 29.06.2019			As per OMMAS as on 29.08.2019		
	Roads	Bridges	Total	Roads	Bridges	Total
Value in Rs. Crores	291.33	23.62	314.95*	291.33/ 259.84	23.62	314.95*
No. of works	12	6	12 roads 6 LSBs	12	6	12 roads 6 LSBs
Length in Km/m	287.225	240.6 m	287.225 Km roads 240.6 m LSBs	287.225	240.6 m	287.225 Km roads 240.6 m LSBs
Average Cost in Lakhs / Km	101.43	9.82/m		101.43	9.82/m	
*MoRD share: Rs 187.32 Crores			State Share: Rs 127.63 Crores			

3. Issues discussed

A. General and DPR Observations

- a. It was observed that out of the 12 roads proposed only 1 road is with 3.75 m carriageway while the rest are proposed with 5.5 m carriage way. It was seen that very high specifications have been proposed with CC pavement of 30 cm thickness and 75 cm pavement on either side. The committee advised the state to take up lean concrete pavements. The state was also told that **only the cost of 5.5 m carriageway will be borne by the Ministry; any cost beyond it will have to be fully borne by the state. (Action point: State Government)**
- b. State had not done any traffic verification (axel load studies) before submitting the specifications for higher traffic. **(Action point: State Government)**
- c. The cost proposed for bridges was higher due to the 7.5 m width specification. NRIDA was asked to recheck the bridge DPRs **(Action point: NRIDA)**
- d. State was asked to recheck all the DPRs where the specifications were too high. State submitted that the DPRs have been checked ; however the costs will further reduced. NRIDA was asked to recheck DPRs. **(Action point: NRIDA)**
- e. The maintenance cost of 7.52% with respect to construction cost is on the lower side. State was asked to increase this. **(Action point: State Government)**
- f. Out of the 287 km total length state had proposed 277.59 km under R&D proposals. State was asked to restrict the length proposed under nano technology. **(Action point: State Government)**
- g. Rate of GSB is higher than WBM II. The State Government submitted that the error was due to an omission in the formula which has been corrected.
- h. The requisite details in Proforma C should be filled such as locations of CDs, protection and side drain works. **(Action point: State Government)**
- i. Provision of maintenance board needs to be included in DPR.
- j. Protection works costing Rs. 599.82 Lac for 6322m length (RS. 25.74 Lac per km) in Package - UP67145 (RCPLWE) and Rs. 391.56 Lac (RS. 19.43 Lac per km) Package - UP67144 (RCPLWE) is on very high side. Chainage location of protection work has not been mentioned in DPR. Road does not passes through hill and valley side and sufficient width is available, state needs to justify the same **(Action point: State Government)**

B. Maintenance issues

- a. Despite satisfactory expenditure on maintenance the U% grading is 23.54% on maintenance works which needs to be looked into by the state. **(Action point: State Government)**
- b. State was asked to upload the reports on maintenance renewal on OMMAS as the reports are incomplete. **(Action point: State Government)**
- c. It was brought out that 755 packages are pending verification in EMarg and 202 packages with missing agreements in OMMAS. **(Action point: State Government)**

C. Status of progress and award of RCPLWE works

- a. It was seen that out of 13 works (254km) sanctioned the state has completed only 4 works (80kms) . State submitted that 8 roads (144kms) were pending due to forest clearance. The committee directed that a letter should be sent both from MHA and MoRD to the state on the issue. **(Action point: MHA and MoRD)**
- b. State was asked to try and achieve the designated targets in the present year.

D. Quality issues

- a. Out of 13 awarded works 9 labs were not established state was directed to take appropriate action on the same.

Decision was taken by the committee that the state would have to relook into the widths and specifications proposed and accordingly correct the DPRs to come to a rational cost.

Meeting ended with thanks to the chair.
