

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 20th March, 2020

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-II) – Minutes thereon.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on 18th March, 2020 from 11:30 AM onwards through Video Conference (VC Code-283746) to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the State Government of Chhattisgarh for the year 2019-20 (Batch-II).

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



(Lalit Kumar)

Under Secretary (RC)

Tel: 011-23382046

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.

Minutes of the Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee held on 18th March, 2020 to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Chhattisgarh under

PMGSY-III, Batch-II (2019-20)

A meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee for PMGSY was held on 18.03.2020 through Video Conferencing under the Chairpersonship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Chhattisgarh under PMGSY-III, Batch-II, 2019-20. The officers from the Ministry, NRIDA and State Government of Chhattisgarh participated in the VC.

Smt. Alka Upadhyaya	Addl. Secretary (RD)
Dr. Surabhi Rai	Director (RC), MoRD
Shri. B C Pradhan	Director (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Dir (F&A), NRIDA
Shri I.K. Pateria	Director (PIII), NRIDA
Shri. Pradeep Agrawal	Director (PI), NRIDA
Shri. P. Mohanasundaram	Joint Director (Technical)
Shri Harsh Nisar	Data Scientist, NRIDA
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri Alok Katiyar	CEO, CGRDA
Shri. A. K. Rahi	Chief Engineer
Shri. Deepak Malewar	Chief Engineer / State Quality Coordinator
Shri. R. K. Dewangan	Superintending Engineer
Shri. S. N. Shukla	Superintending Engineer
M. Ramkaran Shukla	Additional Director/Financial Controller

2. Details of the proposal:-

Item	As per State's proposal dated 09.03.2020				As per OMMAS dated 17.03.2020			
	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)
Roads	207	2,211.14	1,249.16	56.49	181	1,883.29	1,083.13	57.51
Bridges	8	726.10	33.82	4.66	8	726.10	33.82	4.66/m
Total	207 roads 8 LSBs	2,211.14 Kms roads 726.10 m LSBs	1,282.98		181 roads 8 LSBs	1,883.29 Kms roads 726.10 m LSBs	1116.95*	

*MoRD Share : Rs. 670.17 Crores

State Share : Rs. 446.78 Crores

The State of Chhattisgarh has been allocated a road length of 5,612.50 Km under phase-III of Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY). The first batch of proposals of 355 roads of 3,729.17 km and 10 Bridges of 580.58 m have already been sanctioned to the State. The State has now submitted proposals for balance length as per their eligibility, which is detailed above. All the proposals uploaded and scrutinized by STA on OMMAS. Out of 181 roads, 117 roads of 1115.59 km has been proposed with 3.75m carriageway width and 64 roads with 767.71 km road length has been proposed with carriageway width of 5.5 m carriageway width.

The Committee further observed that RQI length is wrongly entered on OMMAS. The State needs to correct RQI length on OMMAS.

The Committee observed that the State has not proposed any road length/target for 7 blocks (Antagarh & Koelibeda in Kanker District, Gharghoda in Raigarh District, Katekalyan in Dantewada District, Orchha in Narayanpur District, Usoor in Bijapur District and Konta in Sukma District). The State Government representative intimated that eligible length is not available in these blocks or the upgradation of the roads have already been done in the other Schemes. The Committee advised the State Government representatives to explore if some rationalization is possible. The Committee also advised that since the implementation period of the scheme is upto March, 2025, the State may explore if some length may be kept aside for these blocks for future proposals once eligible roads are available in these blocks.

The Committee also observed that the cost per km is on higher side in r/o Balod, Bemetra, Bilaspur, Jangir-Champa, Jashpur, Kondagaon, Korla, Kawardha and Raigarh, Rajnandgaon and Narayanpur Districts. The State representatives were asked to review the DPRs of these districts once again.

3. DPR Issues :

- State needs to provide Copy of SLSC approval, MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats and Mandatory certificates duly signed by the competent authority.
- In some DPRs, traffic considered for design of Pavements is different from the traffic survey report attached (CG24211, CG13132).
- 3rd party traffic verification as per IRC guidelines needs to be provided by the State for traffic considered more than 1 MSA.
- Design stage Road Safety Audit details needs to be provided for the roads proposed more than 5 kms length.
- State needs to ensure that the required land width is available to provide 9 m top width as per IRC guidelines. Further, State should ensure that the existing CDs are widened to 9 m width.
- Some roads has earthen track throughout the length except some CC portion. (CG26262)
- In maximum DPRs Culvert length not deducted from pavement length. Need to deduct from pavement length (CG26262, CG06100....)
- Hard shoulder should be proposed only 1m width on either side and maximum 100 mm thickness as per IRC SP:72:2015.

- State proposed Social economical cost need to be deleted or add in state share, this is not the PMGSY provision (CG06100).
- Joint Inspection reports of Bridges sites needs to be provided by the State.

4. Planning Related Issues

Equity	<p>It has been found that some blocks have been portioned a high number of proposals vis-à-vis their DRRP length, whereas some blocks with a large rural road network have been portioned no or little proposals.</p> <p>If the state proceeds with the current batch to its entirety, it's PMGSY target would be complete.</p> <p>Considering target allocated in Batch-I and Batch-II, Kawardha, Korias, Bilaspur, Bemetra, Balod and Surajpur have been already granted targets more than 10% of their DRRP length (as per OMMAS)</p> <p>At the same time, Sukma, Bijapur, Dantewada, Narayanpur, Gariaband and Mahasamund have been accorded targets worth less than 5% of their overall DRRP length. The State representative has informed that these districts are highly sensitive LWE districts and many works sanctioned under RCPLWE and 100-249 population category.</p> <p>7 Blocks have been accorded 0 proposals in both batches.</p> <p>Blocks with high proportion of targets proposed vis-à-vis their DRRP length is as follows:</p>					
	District	Block Name	DRRP Length	Length Proposed	Number of Proposals	%
	Kanker	Charama	349.21	105.75	10	30%
	Surguja	Batauli	246.532	61.45	6	25%
	Balrampur	Rajpur	265.57	54.77	5	21%
	Surajpur	Premnagar	380.67	72.5	6	19%
	Bemetra	Berla	347.037	64.35	9	19%
	Koria	Manedragarh	654.03	118.87	11	18%
	Kanker	Bhanupratappur	501.42	90.9	8	18%
	Raigarh	Lailunga	451.069	76.8	4	17%
	Raigarh	Kharsia	301.45	47.6	4	16%
	Kawardha	Sahaspur/Lohara	474.29	74.855	7	16%
	Korba	Kartala	438.639	68.05	6	16%

At the same time, below is the list of Blocks which have above average rural road network density but have not been proportioned any targets.

District	Block Name	DRRP Length	Length Proposed	Number of Proposals	%
Kanker	Antagarh	667.3	0	0	0%
Raigarh	Gharghoda	335.019	0	0	0%
Dantewada	Katekalyan	336.3	0	0	0%
Kanker	Koelibeda	912.494	0	0	0%
Narayanpur	Orchha	487	0	0	0%
Bijapur	Usoor	451.01	0	0	0%
Sukma	Konta	706.6	0	0	0%
Balrampur	Balrampur	544.958	4.86	1	1%
Dantewada	Kuakonda	418.7	5.5	1	1%
Narayanpur	Narayanpur	742.85	10	1	1%
Surguja	Ambikapur	435.21	6.7	1	2%
Raipur	Dharsiwa	311.274	5.3	1	2%
Balrampur	Kusmi	432.738	8.42	1	2%
Bijapur	Bijapur	578.4	11.5	2	2%
Jashpur	Bagicha	1051.13	21	1	2%
Surguja	Mainpat	424.681	9.94	1	2%
Bastar	Jagdapur	703.03	16.8	1	2%
Surguja	Udaipur	400.01	9.64	1	2%
Bijapur	Bhairamgarh	644.04	15.8	2	2%

The state was asked to reconsider some of the targets and retain for blocks with lower targets or for remaining years of PMGSY-III

Action: The state to explain the variation in target and submit actionable in target if any.

Inadequate Planning and Prioritisation

The following Blocks have not followed the guidelines for planning with regards to selecting continuous candidate roads and mapping of habitations in the 3 km area. Proposals from these block stand rejected from this Batch. The proposals will be deleted from OMMAS and the PIU will be requested to re-do habitation mapping of existing roads under the supervision of SRRDA. Further, high trace map rank roads which were rejected because they weren't merged need to be relooked.

PRE-EC took a strong objection to this and requested the SRRDA to ensure monitoring practices in place to avoid such a situation again in the upcoming batch.

Once, the planning is sufficiently completed, fresh CUCPL will be generated and proposals have to be made with regards to that the freshly generated CUCPL.

S. No.	District	Block
1	Korba	Podiuproda
2	Kawardha	Sahaspur/Lohara
3	Kondagaon	Makdi

The 3 blocks where the habitation mapping not done properly needs to be mapped the habitations located within 3 km and after completing this exercise the new CUCPL will be generated by the State. In case, if the roads proposed under this batch are found eligible in new priority list, the same can be proposed in this batch or otherwise these blocks need to be removed from the current batch. Further, before Batch-III the habitation mapping of the entire state will need to be revised and proposals will need to be generated as per the fresh CUCPL generated.

Individual Cases

Individual cases which need to be inspected:

District	Road	Remark	Action
Mungeli (Lorni)	(T11)-LORMI Mungeli MDR (Parshakapa) TO D2 CANAL	Possibly Y shaped proposal. PMGSY only permits linear and continuous proposals.	SRRDA to study the case vis-a-vis the DPR and submit an ATR.
Kawardha(Bodla)	(T04) Pandatarai NHRoad To Bhonda MDR	GIS length is 7.7 km but proposed length is 11.6 km	SRRDA to study the case vis-a-vis the DPR and submit factual report with appropriate ATR.

Ineligible Roads as Per Pavement Condition	Some of the roads may have good PCI and be ineligible from PMGSY-III or inconsistent with the treatments being proposed.		
	District	Block	Road
	Balod	Dondi Lohara	(MRL01) Bhundeli-Kashikala to Gheena
	Koria	Sonhat	(T01) katgodi to vikrampur
	Kawardha	Sahaspur/ Lohara	T07-SH 09 Biranpurkala To Nawghata Phase -II Road
	Bastar	Lohandiguda	MRL04-badaji to taragaon
	Raigarh	Kharsia	T07-Kharsia Ratanmahka Halahuli se Kalmipath Bagdeva Jharadih Tak
	Koria	Sonhat	T01-katgodi to vikrampur
	Kondagaon	Baderajpur	MRL11-Dhamanpuri to Harwel
	Kondagaon	Baderajpur	MRL09-Amadihi to Kosmi via Sargipal
Korba	Podiuproda	MRL13-Raniatari to T07 Katgora pasan Road Via Senha	
<p>Senior officials in CGRRDA (Not below the rank of Superintending Engineer) need to inspect these roads and ensure that the PCI uploaded on OMMAS is in consonance with the actual conditions of the road. The State was advised to provide only base layer over the exiting damaged BT roads as per Clause 2.2.3 of IRC SP:72:2015. In case, if any portion of the road the existing WBM layers are extensively damaged such cases only GSB should be proposed as per the design requirements. A detailed report of the field inspection of these roads needs to be provided by the State duly signed by the CEO, CGRRDA.</p> <p>If the roads are found to be eligible on the basis of PCI and DLP, the DPRs will be scrutinized by the CGRRDA and ensure that the provisions made in the DPRs is as per the site requirement and there is no excess of provisions included in the DPRs.</p> <p>The report along with an ATR proposal-wise needs to be submitted before the EC.</p> <p>Further, not withstanding above, Chattisgarh has one of the most robust maintenance systems for Rural Roads. It maybe so that large stretches of existing proposed roads will be maintained and in good condition. If the roads are being upgraded, the SRRDA has to ensure economic use of the existing surface/material.</p>			

5. Status of Marketing Reforms

Out of 9 reforms, State has completed 8 reforms. State should comply with rest of the reforms such as unified single market at State level and declaring waterhouse/cold storage, as deemed market before sanctioning of the proposals.

6. Maintenance

State has not uploaded 6th year renewal cost on OMMAS in r/o 33 roads and needs to be uploaded on OMMAS before EC meeting. The State has also not included 5 years maintenance cost after 6th year renewal and the same needs to be included in the DPR.

7. R&D technology

The State has proposed 331 roads/stretchers of 1,531.69 Km with Cold Mix Technology, RCCP, Waste Plastic and Cell filled concrete. While the State has proposed 1,464.01 Km road length with main streaming technology, which is 77.73% of the total length, the road length proposed with Technology with IRC accreditation is only 3.60%, against minimum requirement of 5%. The State needs to propose more length using IRC accredited materials/technologies.

8. Quality Control

Out of 601 no. of ongoing packages, labs have not been established in 33 packages, out of which 30 packages is of more than 6 months. The State representatives intimated that the package relates to RCPLWEA works. The State was also asked expedite pending against completed work and ongoing work are pending with state.

While reviewing the layer-wise quality issue, the Committee observed that unsatisfactory % in sub-base layer is 53%, which is matter of concern. The State assured immediate action to resolve the issue:

9. Fund Position

- i. Rs 546crore (Central share: Rs 327.61 crore, State share: Rs 21839 crore) are yet to be credited to SRRDA
 - ii. 132 works are pending for financial closure, out of which 14 (10.61%) are pending for more than 180 days.
10. The State was asked to furnish the compliance report on the observations of the Pre-Empowered Committee urgently so that the proposal could be placed before the Empowered Committee at the earliest possible.

Meeting ended with Vote of Thanks to and from the Chair.
