

**File No. P-17025/1/2023-RC (eFMS-383015)**

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

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi  
Date: 25<sup>th</sup> January, 2023

**MINUTES**

**Subject: Minutes of the Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee held on 17<sup>th</sup> January, 2023 to discuss project proposals of State of Arunachal Pradesh under PMGSY-III (Batch-I, 2022-23)-reg.**

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the Pre-Empowered Committee meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> January, 2023 at 11:00 A.M under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA (**through Video Conferencing**) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State of Arunachal Pradesh under PMGSY-III (Batch-I, 2022-23).

2. This issues with the approval of the competent authority.



(K.M. Singh)  
Director (RC)

Tel. No: 011-23070308

**Distribution:**

- i. The Secretary, ARRDA, Rural Works Department, Government of Arunachal Pradesh, Itanagar-791111.
- ii. The Chief Engineer, Government of Arunachal Pradesh.
- iii. All Directors in NRIDA.

**Copy for information to:-**

Sr. PPS to Secretary (RD)/ PPS to AS (RD)/ PPS to JS (RC)

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 17<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY, 2023 AT 11:00AM TO CONSIDER PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF ARUNACHAL PRADESH UNDER PMGSY III, BATCH I, 2022-23**

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (RC) was held through Video Conference on 17<sup>th</sup> January, 2023 at 11:00 a.m. under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Arunachal Pradesh under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) (Batch-I) of 2022-23. Following officials were present in the meeting.

<b>MoRD/ NRIDA Representatives</b>	
Dr. Ashish Kumar Goel	Additional Secretary(RD), MoRD & DG, NRIDA
Shri Amit Shukla	Joint Secretary (RC), MoRD
Shri K.M.Singh	Director (RC), MoRD
Shri. B C Pradhan	Consultant (Tech), NRIDA
Dr. I.K.Pateriya	Director (P.III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agarwal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
Shri Nirmal Bhagat	Director (F&A), NRIDA
<b>State Govt. Representatives</b>	
Shri N.T. Glow	Secretary cum CEO
Shri K.C.Dhimole	Technical Advisor
Shri N.Rigia	Chief Engineer
Shri Nayadar Nyodu	SE & SQC
Shri O.Tatak	EE & ITNO
Shri T.Ottu	SE
Shri Bubi Kar	Assistant ITNO

**2. Details of Proposal**

Item	As per OMMAS dated 16.01.2023			
	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km (Lakhs)
Roads	112	829.24 km	908.14	109.51 lakhs/km
LSBs	31	1178.23 m	93.77	7.95 lakhs/m
<b>Total</b>	<b>112 roads + 31 LSBs</b>	<b>829.24 km roads + 1178.23 m LSBs</b>	<b>1001.91*</b>	
*MoRD Share : Rs. 901.73Crore Target : 1375 km			State share : Rs 100.19 Crore	

### 3. General Observations

- i) The State Government of Arunachal Pradesh has been allocated a road length 1375 km under PMGSY-III. This is the first proposal submitted by the State under PMGSY-III.
- ii) The State has submitted proposals for 112 roads of 829.24 km and 31 LSBs. Out of 112 roads, 105 roads of 733.04 km road length have been proposed with 3.75 m carriageway width at an average cost of Rs. 105.79 lakh/ km and 7 roads of 96.2 km road length have been proposed with carriageway width of 5.50 m at an average cost of Rs. 137.82 lakh/ km.
- iii) All proposals have been uploaded and scrutinized by the STAs on OMMAS. However, PTA scrutiny has not been done for any proposal. It was mentioned that the PTA for the state is IIT Kharagpur, which seems to be too busy academically and therefore it was suggested to make IIT Guwahati as PTA for Arunachal Pradesh, if feasible. The proposal for the same should be examined by NRIDA.

### 4. Average Cost Trends

- i) It was observed that, the average cost of 3.75 m wide roads sanctioned in 2018-19 under PMGSY-I (new connectivity) was Rs.82 lakh/ km and the average cost of 3.75 m wide roads sanctioned in 2019-20 under PMGSY-II (upgradation) was Rs. 78.76 lakh/ km. In the current proposal, the roads proposed with 3.75 m width have an average cost of Rs. 105.79 lakh/ km and the roads proposed with 5.5 m width have an average cost of Rs. 137.82 lakh/ km, which seems to be on much higher side when we compare with these sanctioned works. State was asked to explain the same.
- ii) It was also observed that, in most proposals, State has made provisions from GSB level and above, which is done in case of new construction, and this was found to be one of the reasons for high pavement cost and thus high average cost. **In the proposal, State has not given any credit to the existing road surface. Non-pavement cost was also found to be on much higher side in a large number of proposals. It was decided to send a team of officials from NRIDA/ NQMs to physically examine these proposals, and carry out the scrutiny of all DPRs of the state. These teams will also do the planning audit (on Geo-Sadak) and see if roads taken are justifiable as per the objectives of PMGSY-III.**
- (iii) On inquiry, it was also found that the State has not provisioned any new technology in base and sub-base course. New technology has been provisioned only in the surface course. CTB (with or without FDR) technology has also not been proposed in any proposal. State mentioned that FDR wouldn't be economical for them and they would not be able to find good contractor as size of proposal would be too small to invite good contractor. State was suggested to club some works to form a single package and bid accordingly in order to ensure that prospective bidders may find these bids attractive enough to bid for. They should send their team to UP and get more information on FDR. Nagaland, Tripura and Assam are proposing FDR among the NE States, and there is no reason why Arunachal Pradesh cannot do it, as the state faces a problem of availability of aggregate.



iv) In Lower Siang district, State has provisioned an entire road with concrete block pavements. Committee made it clear to the State that such roads cannot be allowed. CC portion can only be allowed in hugely populated area, an entire road cannot be constructed with CC. NRIDA was asked to ensure that all DPRs are checked thoroughly and delete such roads from the proposal.

## 5. Planning Audit (Proposals)

i) Out of 112 roads, 107 roads and 31 LSBs have been uploaded on GEOSADAK. 107 roads have been audited by NRIDA for their utility as TR/ MRL under PMGSY-III and 48 roads have been flagged for justification, as these were not found eligible as per programme guidelines and out of these 48 roads, 21 roads have been flagged because these are link routes. So far, State has furnished justification in respect of only 29 roads; justification for other roads needs to be furnished by the State at the earliest. **Committee mentioned that the team visiting the State shall do the planning audit also in detail. NRIDA will also examine the geo-sadak alignment of all these roads and also show the same to DG, NRIDA.**

ii) One road "MRL01-PWD Road to Tinali (HQ) via Mobuk" in Lower Dibang Valley district has 100% non-BT surface. Committee mentioned that, 100% kutchra road cannot be considered under PMGSY-III, **as new construction is not the mandate of this scheme. It was suggested to delete this road.**

iii) Another road "MRL02-Road from NH Road to Yagrung" in Lower Dibang Valley district has 100% non-BT surface. State justified that, the proposed alignment passes through the major agricultural hubs of Dambuk block and also connects the benefitted habitation with agricultural fields, agricultural collection centres & primary school. Committee made it clear to the State that, if the road is connecting the habitation to some agricultural markets/ Gramin mandis, then only the road is considered eligible under PMGSY-III. **Committee suggested the State to delete this road.**

iv) Another road "MRL11-Parbuk to Baksek" in Lower Dibang Valley district was found to have 100% non-BT/ CC surface, hence was not found eligible. It was also observed that, this road is connecting 2 habitations only which are having very less population and an alternate road is already available. **Committee suggested the State to delete this road.**

v) **Committee desired that, all the 112 roads should be checked on GEOSADAK.**

## 6. Proposed length less than the eligible length

i) It was observed that the state has proposed the following 30 roads with proposed length less than the eligible length and with the variation of more than 15%:-

"AR1004033, AR10/03/087, AR24 AR/12/08/23, AR1006003, AR2309/01/03, AR1805/836, AR1805/831, AR1402/006, AR120711, AR2106046, AR2104099, AR0902015, AR1908/65, AR904007, AR25/01/61, AR0602/3082, AR2501/082, AR0201/034, AR22, AR09/01/030, AR22, AR09/01/048, AR04/50/263903, AR2104093, AR0306003, AR120104, AR120106, AR1002022, AR0305006, AR1002008, AR1403042, AR1102005"

**State was asked to provide road-wise justification, as to why the complete eligible road length was not proposed for these roads.**

## **7. Existing Surface**

i) It was observed that, 17 roads have less than 50% BT/CC surface. Committee asked to delete all these 17 roads unless some roads are of extreme importance for which State will have to give proper justifications for their inclusion. Committee further asked the State to give road-wise justification in respect of 8 roads having 50-75% existing BT/ CC surface. These roads will be considered in exceptional circumstances only if these are of high importance and fulfill the objectives of PMGSY-III.

ii) Further, committee asked to re-verify if all the roads are existing BT/CC roads. For this purpose the photographs should be checked, and teams sent to the state should also check the same on the ground. If these are existing roads, then CD and protection works should already be present, and only upgradation/ repair/ select replacement might be required for the same. For pavement also, substantial compaction would already have been achieved, and thus requirement of structural layers should reduce accordingly.

## **8. High Priority Roads skipped in CUCPL**

i) It was observed that 66 high priority roads have been skipped citing 'ownership with different department' as the reason. Committee however observed that these roads can't be skipped until these are being constructed by the owner department; otherwise, they can be included under PMGSY-III after taking No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the owner department. State needs to provide road-wise justification with documents.

ii) **It was observed that, 48 roads have been skipped due to land issue. State was asked to provide road-wise justification for the same.**

## **9. Length-wise proposal details**

i) It was observed that 2 proposed roads are of less than 3 km. Reason for including these roads was sought from the state. State representative mentioned that, the candidate road length is more than 5 km, the eligible length is less than 3 km. Committee asked NRIDA to re-check these 2 roads on GEOSADAK along with 9 roads of 3 to 5 km length.

## **10. PCU/ day details**

i) It was observed that, 72 roads have less than 500 PCU/ day. **Committee asked the State to justify as to how these roads are MRL with such less traffic. Committee mentioned that, if MDRs are available and the State is not able to upgrade those roads, then they may de-notify those roads as MDR and convert them to ODR and include under PMGSY-III. State representative mentioned that, PIUs have already been asked to do this exercise. They informed that approximately 2000 Km MDRs are available with PWD. Committee asked the State to complete this exercise immediately.**

ii) State was asked to justify the reason for taking 3 roads having PCU/ day 1500-2000 with 5.5 m width. Further committee suggested that, a single road which is already 5.5 m wide should only be taken with 5.5 m width. All other roads proposed with 5.5 m width may be considered with the existing 3.75 m width, as the traffic category of all these roads is less, up to T6 only. This aspect should be examined by the state in detail keeping in view the PCU and the traffic category.



- ii) State was asked to make provision of stabilization technology (with or without FDR).
- iii) All CC pavement should be taken with cell-filled or panel CC technology.

#### **16. Physical Progress**

- i) It was observed that, 124 roads of 1151 km and 64 bridges are pending under PMGSY-I and 5 roads of 38 km are pending under PMGSY-II. The commitment made by the state in past for completing these roads has not been fulfilled. State was asked to look into it and completed the balance works at the earliest.
- ii) Against the annual physical target of 2308 km and 84 habitations, state has so far constructed only 1100 km (48%) and provided connectivity to only 36 habitations. State was asked to complete the balance works at the earliest.

#### **17. Maintenance Abstract/ Renewal Length Status**

- i) It was observed that, fund received status and renewal length data is not updated by the state. State was asked to verify and update the same. State was informed that the funds received against DLP are only to be entered in OMMAS.

#### **18. eMarg**

- i) A total of 39 (13%) packages are pending for locking on OMMAS. 44 (14%) packages are pending for MEE. RI has been missed in 18 (19%) of works in the month of December, 2022. 58 (31%) packages are pending for first payment on eMarg.
- ii) Total expenditure done through eMarg in FY 2022-23 is Rs. 10.13 crore, out of which only Rs. 1.64 crore has been spent on the liability of FY 2022-23, which shows that maximum expenditure is being done on the liability of previous years. State was asked to look into it and monitor the e-Marg implementation seriously. State was made clear that, until and unless eMarg is implemented seriously, PMGSY-III works would not be sanctioned.

#### **19. Quality**

- i) Out of 146 ongoing packages, labs have not been established in 3 packages. State needs to look into it.
- ii) 29 works have not been inspected by SQMs even once. This was observed to be a serious issue and the state was asked to get these works inspected in next 15 days.
- ii) Against the target of 654 SQM inspections in FY 2022-23, 520 inspections have been conducted. State was asked to conduct the remaining inspections at the earliest.
- iii) In the last three years (January, 2020- December 2022), 70.37% maintenance works, 10.61 % completed works and 9.91% ongoing works have been graded as unsatisfactory in NQM inspections. In the last one year (January, 2022- December 2022), 33.33 % maintenance works, 13.51 % completed works and 11.21% ongoing works have been graded as unsatisfactory in NQM inspections. State needs to look into the quality aspects.

iv) It was also observed that, the SQMs are not giving the commensurate unsatisfactory percentage and there is huge difference between the gradings of NQM s and SQMs.

v) ATRs of NQM inspections are pending for 43 ongoing works and 24 completed works. State was informed that, the completed works for which ATRs are pending for more than a year shall be treated as non-rectifiable. State was asked to expedite the submission of the ATRs.

vi) ATR on One complaint regarding "Irregularities in construction of work" in the district Dibang Valley is pending. State was asked to send the ATR on the complaint at the earliest.

vii) It was observed that the SQMs giving less unsatisfactory percentage are getting more number of inspections. State should evaluate the performance of SQMs and then allot the inspections. Such SQMs having the habit giving more satisfactory percentages should not be allotted more number of inspections. Further, committee mentioned that the following SQMs may not be allotted any inspections until their performance evaluation is done:-

*Bora Amirul Islam, Choudhury Bhupesh Ranjan, Duori Probin, Gogoi Diganta Kumar, Paul Tonay, Sarma Mrinal Kumar, Singh Ajay Kumar, Singh Bhupendra Vikram.*

## 20. Financial issues

i) Interest amount of Rs. 5.24 crore is pending for recovery from bank. State should get the amount recovered at the earliest.

ii) Interest Verification for FY 2004-05 to 2009-10 & 2020-21 to 2021-22 has not been submitted. State was asked to submit the same at the earliest.

iii) 52 works pending for financial closure for more than 180 days as on 13-01-2023. State was asked to expedite the financial closure of these works.

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.

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

\*\*\*\*