

No-P.17024/27/2017-RC (FMS-355978)

Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 8th February, 2018

Sub: Minutes of the meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee held on 2.2.2018 to discuss project proposals of the State of Uttarakhand under regular PMGSY (Batch-III, 2017-18)

The undersigned is directed to forward herewith minutes of the meeting of Pre Empowered Committee held on 2nd February, 2018 under the Chairpersonship of Joint Secretary (RC) to discuss project proposals of the State of Uttarakhand under regular PMGSY (Batch-III, 2017-18) for necessary action.

2. State Government is requested to submit compliance report on the observations of the Pre-Empowered Committee at an early date in order to enable the Ministry to fix date for Empowered Committee meeting.

Surabhi Rai

(Dr Surabhi Rai)

Deputy Secretary (RC)

Telephone No 011- 23383006

Distribution:

- i. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Uttarakhand, Dehradun. - 123259/18
- ii. The Chief Engineer, Rural Development Department, Government of Uttarakhand, Dehradun. - 123259/18-1

~~Copy to: PPS to JS (RC)/All Director of NRRDA, New Delhi.~~

(32619/18)

(i) to (3)

1350000
9/2/18

Minutes of the Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee held on 02.02.2018 for the proposals of the State of Uttarakhand under PMGSY, Batch III (2017-18)

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee for PMGSY was held on **02.02.2018** in the chamber of Joint Secretary (RC) to discuss the proposals under Regular PMGSY (Batch-III, 2017-18). The following officials were present in the meeting: -

Smt. Alka Upadhyaya	Joint Secretary(RC) & DG(NRRDA)
Dr. Surabhi Rai	Deputy Secretary(RC)
Dr. I. K. Pateriya	Dir (Tech), NRRDA
Shri Uttam Kumar	Dir (P.III)
Smt. Shantipriya	Dir (Finance)
Shri Praveen Kumar	DD (F&A)
State Govt. representatives from Uttarakhand	
Shri. K.K. Srivastava	Chief Engineer
Smt Pratima Painuly	Financial Controller
Shri S.K. Pathak	SQC
Shri A.S. Jyala	ITNO

2. Proposal by the State:

Item	Proposals as per State's email dated 31.01.2018					Proposals as per OMMAS as on 01.02.2018				
	Stage I	Full stage	Stage II	LSBs	Total	Stage I	Full stage	Stage II	LSBs	Total
Value in Rs. Crores	604.14	193.86	478.26	51.59	1327.85	617.62	200.53	495.23	41.85	1,355.23*
No. of works	107	27	95	27	229 roads 27 LSBs	107	27	95	23	229 roads 23 LSBs
Length in Km	964.26	277.96	796.07	852 m	2038.29 Kms 852 m LSBs	964.26	277.96	796.07	714.00	2,038.29 m roads 714 m LSBs
Average Cost in Lakhs Km	62.65	69.74	60.08	6.06		64.05	72.14	62.21	5.86	

*MoRD share: Rs. 1,218.81 Crores

State share: Rs. 136.42 Crores

Category wise benefitted Habitations

1000+	500-900	250-499	Total
2	22	158+2 Clusters	182+2 clusters of 250+

- 229 roads of (2038.29 km) and 25 LSRs (714m) have been proposed at a cost of Rs. 1355.23 crores (MoRD share Rs. 1218.81 crores and State Share Rs. 136.42 crores) by the State. This proposal will benefit 2 (1000+), 22 (500 – 999), 158+2 clusters (250 – 499) and 182+2 clusters (250+). The State has not uploaded the corrected cost on OMMAS as of now. State was asked to give both stages in one time. It was observed that 107 Stage I was submitted. State submitted that Stage II would be submitted at the end of February. It was said that tendering would be a problem. Consolidated Bid of 24 months can be done.

3. Number of Eligible unconnected habitations:

- 38 habitations are remaining. 93 habitations wrongly shown as unconnected, so geotagged photographs are required.
- Balance 131 proposals would be submitted by the State.

4. General and DPR Issues:

- Cost is comparable to the last batch in case of full stage while The cost is higher than the earlier batch in Stage I and stage II. The cost is due higher SOR, as said by the State. State was asked to relook into the proposal.
- State was advised to look into the higher costs of specific districts.
- Copy of SLSC approval, MP-I, MP-II and MP-III needs to be provided by the State. State was told that the proposal will not be considered in the absence of these documents.
- Out of 229 roads, there is no change in cost of 98 roads, indicating these are reviewed. Sample DPRs from these 98 roads will be examined by NRRDA and the observations communicated to them.
- The credit for hard rock obtained from cutting has not been incorporated in many of the DPRs. Hard rock obtained from the cutting should be used for protective/drain works. State contended that it is incorporated in the SOR. However, State was asked to look into it.
- Gabion retaining walls may be proposed in place of banded retaining wall to achieve economy in construction.
- Naturally occurring GSB has not been proposed and blended quarry material is being used as GSB for arriving at rate which is about Rs. 1,800/Cum and is on higher side. This is increasing the overall cost/Km. State needs to provide the gradation details and CBR test results of naturally occurring granular materials for each district. The reasons for using graded GSB in all the roads was questioned. State said that it was local material. The committee pointed out that **the rate of Rs. 1800/- cum for local material was found to be illogical.** State was asked to check the same.
- Average cost is on higher side for all districts when compared to previous batches of 2016-17 and 2017-18.
- Clear coloured photographs at every 100m intervals are not attached.
- Soil test report only indicates CBR value, other soil test parameters such as sieve analysis, MDD, OMC, LL, PL etc. are not attached in DPR.

- In Stage-I construction works, existing and proposed levels in C/S drawings are not indicated to ascertain the required quantities of earth work for cutting and filling. Most of the cases Ruling Gradient have been adopted for the entire length of the road which increase the earth work cost.
- Earth work quantities are on higher and should be rationalised for achieving economy as per expert committee report.
- Existing and proposed Slab culverts, causeway and LSBs length should be deleted in the pavement length to avoid duplication of quantities.
- Pucca side drains proposed for entire length. Pucca drains may be required where the soil strata are loose. Needs to be rationalised.
- Provision of protection works including retaining wall, breast wall, toe wall etc. for both stage I and complete construction works are found to be on higher side even of order 30 to 40% of road length. This contributes in the substantial increase in construction cost.
- linear water way calculations and hydraulic particulars showing MWL, HFL, BL etc are also not attached in DPRs.
- As per IRC SP:48, in the banded retaining wall, the bands may be in CM 1:6. However, the State has proposed with CM 1:5. Needs to be justified.
- Turfing, Seeding & Mulching and bio engineering work, these cost should come from State share.
- Joint Inspection formats for bridge works have not been received.

5. Maintenance issues:

- State has proposed Rs. 13,605.11 Lakhs as maintenance cost which is 10.36% w.r.t construction cost.

6. R& D Proposals:

- Barium Carbide waste technology has been wrongly uploaded by State.
- Committee advised that Soil Stabilization technologies should be proposed by the State

7. R&D Technology:

- 648.08 Km which is 60% of total length has been proposed under technology with IRC specification. Only 19.58 Km which is 1.82% of total length has been proposed under technology with IRC accreditation. State needs to propose more length under IRC Accredited material / technology.

8. Quality issues:

Only 37% expenditure has been done in maintenance fund in present year. State need to increase the expenditure in maintenance fund in the present year.

- Out of total 683 sanctioned projects 221 projects are unawarded. 657 inspections are required for completed projects and 486 inspections are required for ongoing projects.
- In 38 works it was seen that SQM inspections have not been done even once. In 6 cases package of over 1 Lakh has been made for works not inspected even once by SQMs.
- 94 contractors have not been inspected by NQMs even once. 87 constructions which have not been inspected have less than 3 works in hand, 6 have 3 works in hand and 1 contractor has more than 5 works in hand.
- Only 40% of maintenance is under satisfactory category.

9. Miscellaneous Issues

- During the course of the meeting, it was also pointed out that the state has a target of complete 2,000 km of road length in the present fiscal. In addition, the state would be submitting DPRs for 481 habitations (Stage-I&II) under new connectivity and up gradation proposals for 4190 km road length (PMGSY-I&II) in upcoming months. The state is yet to take its share of 915 km in PMGSY 2, which would be possible only after all sanctions and 90% works have been awarded.
- In light of above stated quantum of works and preponement of the completion deadline of PMGSY to 2019, it was observed that the State may not be able to meet the demands with its present execution capacity. The state pointed out that the capacity of State Rural Road Agency (SRRDA) may be enhanced with additional divisions from other departments of the State as well.

The meeting ended with thanks to the Chair.
