

File No. P-17024/12/2020-RC (369983)

Government of India

Ministry of Rural Development

Department of Rural Development

KrishiBhavan, New Delhi

Dated the 5th August, 2020.

Minutes

Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the State Government of Karnataka for the 2020-21(Batch-II) -reg.

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Pre- Empowered Committee held on 30th July, 2020 through Video Conferencing (VC Code:- 297308) to consider the project proposals for Pradhan Mantri Gram SadakYojana-III (PMGSY-III) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action.



(Anurag Bhatnagar)
Assistant Commissioner (RC)
Tele No.:- 011-2338 1343

Distribution:

1. The Principal Secretary, (Panchayat Raj & Rural Development Department), Govt. of Karnataka, 3rd floor, M. S Building R, KR Circle Bengaluru, Karnataka.
2. The Chief Engineer Karnataka Rural Road Development Agency, 3rd Floor, Grameenabhivrudhi Bhavan, Anand Rao Circle, Bengaluru-9.

Copy for information to:-

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

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE
HELD ON 30th JULY, 2020 AT 11.00 AM TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT
PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA UNDER
PMGSY III (BATCH II), 2020-21**

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee was held through Video Conference on 30th July, 2020 at 11.00 AM under the Chairpersonship of Additional Secretary, Department of Rural Development & DG, NRIDA to consider the proposal of the State of Karnataka under PMGSY III (Batch II) of 2020-21. Following officials were present in the meeting.

| | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Smt. Alka Upadhyaya | Addl. Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA |
| Dr Ashish Kumar Goel | Joint Secretary, (RC), MoRD |
| Miss Mamta | Joint Director (RC), MoRD |
| Shri. B C Pradhan | Director (Tech), NRIDA |
| Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul | Director (F&A), NRIDA |
| Shri I.K.Pateria | Director (PIII), NRIDA |
| Shri P. Mohansundaram | Joint Director, NRIDA |
| Shri Harsh Nisar | Data Scientist, NRIDA |
| State Govt. Representatives | |
| Shri. Prabhakar D Hamigi | Chief Engineer, KRRDA, Karnataka |
| Shri. C. K Mallappa | SQC, KRRDA |
| Shri Ravanna. R | Financial Controller |
| Dr. Bhoovanahalli Nagaraj | Director, RDPR |
| Shri M. K. Vidyashankar | Executive Engineer & GIS ITNO, KRRDA |
| Smt. Radha. K | ITNO, KRRDA |

2. Current Proposal by the State:

i. A detailed presentation on the proposal of PMGSY III, (Batch II) of 2020-21 submitted by the State of Karnataka was made by NRIDA before the Pre-Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:-

| As per State's proposal | | | | | Length (in km), Cost (Rs in Crores) As per OMMAS as on 29.07.2020 | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Item | No of Roads | Length (in km) | Cost (Rs in Crores) | Avg. Cost/k m (Lakhs) | No of Roads | Length (in km) | Cost (Rs in Crores) | Avg. Cost/k m (Lakhs) |
| Up-gradation | 334 | 2,086.63 | 1,374.57 | 65.88 | 334 | 2,086.25 | 1,375.82 | 65.95 |
| LSBs on current batch of roads | 54 | 1,660.40 | 66.43 | 4.00 | 47 | 1,515.50 | 60.40 | 4.00 |
| LSBs on roads sanctioned in 2019-20 | 33 | 1,028.50 | 60.73 | 5.90 | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|-------------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|----------|
| Total | 334 roads | 2,086.63 km roads | 1501.73 | 334 roads | 2,086.25 km roads | 1436.22* |
| | 87 LSBs | 2,688.90 m | | 47 LSBs | 1,515.50 m | |

*MoRD Share: Rs. 845.50 Crores

State Share: Rs. 590.72 Crores

PMGSY-III Target: 5,612.50 Kms

Sanctioned: 3,226.14 km under (batch I, 2019-20) PMGSY III.

ii. 40 LSBs have not yet been finalised by PIUs. *These LSBs should be finalised and scrutinized by STA and PTA and uploaded on OMMAS. State officials have assured that it will be done within 1-2 weeks.*

iii. No proposal has been scrutinised by PTA on OMMAS yet. 10% of the proposal should be scrutinised by PTA as per the provision of PMGSY guidelines.

3. Carriageway width wise and Average cost wise details of road

- i. 325 roads of 2030.39 km are 3.75 m wide with an average cost of Rs 65.47 lakh/km, 8 roads of 50.51 km are 5.5 m wide with an average cost of Rs. 85.82 lakh/km and 1 road of 5.37 km are 7 m wide with an average cost of Rs 57.17 lakh/km.

While discussing the average cost of roads per km, it was observed that average cost of some of the roads having 5.5 m and 3.75 m width are higher than the road having 7 m width which should be justified by the State. Overall average cost of roads proposed in the present proposal is higher than the earlier batch and needs re-examination by the State. Pre EC suggested that seeing the good surface condition of many of the roads, the State should pose such roads if at all required under 20% component under RQI. CD replacement proposals should be backed by appropriate justification so that cost economy may be obtained. Details of CDs proposed whether being strengthened or replaced, details regarding when was old CD constructed and design details may be given by the State.

4. Length wise details of road

- i. Out of 334 roads, 2 roads of 4.81 km are of 2-3 km length with an average cost of Rs 75.05 lakh/km. 107 roads of 432.21 km are of 3-5 km length with an average cost of Rs 65 lakh/km. 225 roads of 1649.23 km are of more than 5 km with an average cost of Rs 66.12 lakh/km. State may consider dropping 2 roads being less than 3 km.

5. Traffic wise details of road

- i. Out of 334 roads, 278 roads of 1757.76 km are in less than T5 category, 20 roads of 129.98 km are in T6, T7 and T8 category and 27 roads of 142.63 Km are in T9 category under 3.75 m carriageway width.
- ii. Under 5.5 m carriageway width, 1 road of 7.02 km are in less than T5 category, 1 road of 4.40 km are in T6, T7 and T8 category and 6 roads of 39.09 km are in T9 category. Under 7 m carriageway width 1 road of 5.37 km are in less than

T5 category. Pre EC wanted justification as to how road in less than T5 traffic category is proposed with 7 m carriageway width.

6. DPR observations

Following DPR issues were presented for consideration before Pre EC:

- i. State needs to provide MP's consent letter as per Ministry's advisory dated 02.06.2020 along with MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats duly signed by the competent authority. *State should comply with the observation.*
- ii. Out of 39 sample DPRs received, 11 have been scrutinised and remaining are under scrutiny at NRIDA. *NRIDA should scrutinize all sample DPRs. Sample should also be drawn from high cost DPRs and high cost districts, especially where from the cost has increased tremendously in this batch of proposals compared to the previous batch.*
- iii. It was observed that average cost per km is on the higher side when compared to previous batch for several districts. *State should reassess the cost structure of roads in high cost districts and revise the average cost at par with previous batch and other states. Nine districts were highlighted in which cost increase has been disproportional and DPRs of these districts should be reassessed.*
- iv. 3rd party traffic survey or axle load survey details need to be provided wherever roads proposed are more than 1 MSA, as per guidelines. Design stage Road Safety Audit details needs to be provided for the proposed roads which are more than 5 kms length. *State should send the compliance on this.*
- v. In maximum DPRs the test results for GSB materials are not attached to the DPR. *Required information may be provided by the State.*
- vi. The cost towards road safety items is on the higher side. On an average Rs 4 to 5 Lakhs/km has been proposed. *It needs revision.*
- vii. Credit for existing crust has not been taken (KN04119). In certain cases only very meager quantity has been taken. The State needs to explore the possibility to use the existing WBM layers without disturbance by providing overlay as per Clause 2.2.3 of IRC:SP:72:2015 read with clause 6.2 to economize the cost of construction. *This is directly linked with cost economy hence requires attention of the State. Pre EC suggested that surface conditions of the existing roads proposed for upgradation may be provided by the State.*
- viii. In some DPRs tack coat provision has not been made over the BM layer. *State should make such provision.*
- ix. All existing CDs have been replaced and higher number of new CDs proposed. The cost of CDs/km for Karnataka State is Rs 11.17 Lakhs/km whereas the total average for the States sanctioned/considered by EC/Pre EC is Rs 7.31 Lakhs/km. CDs need to be justified and rationalised. *Pre EC observed that not all CDs may need replacement. State should relook the matter and replacement of CDs should be proposed only in cases where it is properly justified*

based on the actual site condition, along with photographs. In all other cases, repair of CDs should be proposed.

- x. In every culvert, embankment construction has been proposed. The same length has also been added in road portion for embankment construction, which needs to be deleted.
- xi. Stone pitching/apron has been proposed invariably in all CDs and this provision is not required for small CDs. This needs to be deleted.
- xii. Utility duct (300 mm dia pipe) has been proposed in the DPRs with concrete side wall. Burring and laying of such conduit/ pipe should be proposed without side walls.
- xiii. RCC retaining wall has been proposed which needs to be justified with X section drawings and for economical construction it must be either RR masonry or PCC.
- xiv. State has proposed 1% of project cost towards shifting water supply lines, Utility shifting ie shifting Electric/Telephone poles and LS provision made for a forestation charges. State has not uploaded this cost under higher specification for many of the roads. *State should bear additional cost under higher specification and shift the entries accordingly.*
- xv. Bridge Joint Inspection reports have not been received. Reports should be sent.

7. Trace Map Ranking

Out of 334 roads, 109 roads i.e. 32.63 % of the proposals are in the top 15% trace map ranking and 192 roads i.e. 57.5 % are in top 50% ranking as shown in the following table.

| Trace map rank | Numbers of roads | % |
|----------------|------------------|--------|
| 0 to 15 | 109 | 32.63% |
| 16 to 50 | 83 | 24.85% |
| 51 to 100 | 72 | 21.56% |
| >100 | 70 | 20.96% |
| Total | 334 | |

8. Compliance pending from previous EC

Following are the State's compliance on the observations made during previous EC:

- i. 7 blocks had been rejected due to habitation mapping issues. NRIDA has observed that 2 blocks are still unsatisfactory and need to regenerate CUCPL. SRRDA needs to do habitation mapping. *State should comply with habitation mapping correction.*
- ii. 30 Blocks were requested to increase candidate road coverage, which has now

been done by the State.

iii. 3 blocks from Aspirational Districts didn't have proposals but have now been included.

iv. On the observation regarding district wise target allocation vis-a-vis proportion of DRRP length, State has informed that three aspects namely, geographical area of block, population and DRRP length were taken into consideration while finalising the proposal for the current batch. It was also informed that the proposal has the approval of SLSC. *Pre EC suggested the State to look into the issue of district/ block wise equity while finalizing the proposal.*

9. Districts/Blocks required to Redo Planning in Previous Batch

Following is the status of 7 blocks which were asked to redo habitation mapping/ planning of all TR/MRL and regenerate CUCPL in the previous batch.

| District | Block | Remark/ Observation |
|-------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Udupi | Udupi | Corrected and proposals as per new priority |
| Mysore | Mysore | Corrected and proposals as per new priority |
| Koppal | Koppal | Corrected and proposals as per new priority |
| Chitradurga | Chitradurga | Corrected and proposals as per new priority |
| Shimoga | Sagar | Corrected and proposals as per new priority |
| Bellary | Kudligi | Unsatisfactory Habitation Mapping, Redo Planning |
| Tumkur | Gubbi | Unsatisfactory Habitation Mapping, Redo Planning |

10. Districts/Blocks required to Redo Planning in Current Batch

The following blocks have been asked to redo habitation mapping of all TR/MRL and regenerate CUCPL of current Batch due to unsatisfactory habitation mapping.

| District | Block |
|----------|------------|
| Bellary | Kudligi |
| Tumkur | Gubbi |
| Bagalkot | Jamakhandi |
| Bellary | Hospet |
| Bidar | Bhalki |

11. Utility of Missing Links

It was observed that certain existing track/gravel proposals are being upgraded to BT standards while parallel to existing BT roads and/or not reducing travel time significantly. It was also observed that certain proposals have Y/T shaped chain-ages. *The State has been asked to verify all proposals where majority proposal is new construction and sending justification for the alignments/missing link/distance reduction.*

12. Blocks to Give Details about Exemption of CUCPL

SRRDA has to do verification of exclusions in following blocks and submit detailed version of each exclusion where existing reason is not satisfactory. Any wrongly

excluded road should be considered for proposal. Further, list of wrongly excluded roads based on Riding Surface Improvement will be sent for verification.

| District | Block |
|----------|--------------|
| Bagalkot | Badami |
| Bagalkot | Hungund |
| Bagalkot | Bagalkot |
| Bagalkot | Mudhol |
| Bellary | Sandoor |
| Bellary | Bellary |
| Bellary | Hospet |
| Bidar | Humnabad |
| Mysore | Mysore |
| Mysore | T. Narasipur |
| Udupi | Udupi |

13. Progress of PMGSY works

Under PMGSY-III (batch I, 2019-20), State was sanctioned 445 works of length 3226.14 km and 26 LSBs was sanctioned on 2nd March, 2020. Against the sanctioned works, LoA on 170 works of around 2000 km has been issued and 20 works have been started on ground. It was informed that balance works will be awarded soon. Pre-EC suggested that state to should strive to award all the works of the previous batch before EC.

14. Maintenance

The Empowered Committee agreed to the State's proposal of Rs. 12,049.32 (8.76% of the construction cost) for 5 years routine maintenance cost. However, it was observed that the present proposal for the 6th year renewal cost of Rs 21,508.12 lakh is only 15.63 % of the construction cost. It should ideally be about 18-20%.

Additionally, 5 years maintenance cost after 6th year's renewal needs to be included in the DPR by State. It was observed that for some works the State has updated less than 10%, even '0' cost which needs to be corrected.

15. Maintenance: Finance

State has incurred Rs. 143.25 crore (66%) against the requirement of Rs 216.91 crore during the last 7 years on maintenance of roads under DLP. During FY 2020-21 against the requirement of Rs 45 crore, Rs 5 crore (11%) has been utilized upto June, 2020. However no fund has been credited to SRRDA yet which is pending in the administrative department as reported by the State. Overall unsatisfactory % based on NQM inspections is 12% during the last 7 years. However, Pre EC observed that no NQM inspection has been done during FY 2020-21. State has reported that SQM inspections are under progress.

16. e-Marg Status

Out of 279 total workable packages, 160 are locked. Manual expenditure has been

entered against 9 packages only and payment of Rs 28.08 lakh is made. Out of 147 contractors, only 91 have registered so far. Progress of the State in onboarding e-Marg is slow. State should complete the process at the earliest as monitoring of maintenance of roads under PMGSY III will be done through e-Marg. State should give attention on maintenance of roads to bring the quality indicator at par with National Level. The onboarding should be completed by 15.08.20.

17. R & D Proposals

The State has proposed 190 roads of 370.48 km using various new technologies as indicated below:

| Sl.No | Name of Technology | No | Length(in Km) |
|-------|--------------------------|------------|---------------|
| 1 | Waste Plastics | 84 | 204.19 |
| 2 | RCCP | 4 | 0.69 |
| 3 | Cold Mix | 7 | 14.47 |
| 4 | Slag | 1 | 0.70 |
| 5 | Cell filled concrete | 26 | 7.40 |
| 6 | Coir Technology | 39 | 77.40 |
| 7 | Zycosoil Nano technology | 12 | 23.22 |
| 8 | Geo cell/Geo textile | 5 | 21.20 |
| 9 | Terrazyme | 8 | 10.81 |
| 10 | Other Technologies* | 4 | 10.40 |
| | Total | 190 | 370.48 |

* Technology needs to be specified in the case of roads being built using other technologies.

** DPRs need to be scrutinized on sample basis for the roads using IRC Accredited Materials/Technologies.

Committee has agreed to the State's proposal of 220.05 km (10.55%) under Mainstreaming of Technology and 140.31 Km (6.71%) under IRC Accredited Materials/Technologies as per the PMGSY-III guidelines.

18. Finance Issues

The Pre EC Committee observed that State has to release pending State share of Rs. 375.32 crore from State treasury before coming for EC.

19. The Pre- Empowered Committee suggested that the state should send the compliance on all the observations mentioned in the foregoing paras so that EC meeting for sanctioning of the proposal could be conducted at an early date.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to and from the Chair.