

No.P-17024/8/2019-RC (FMS-369627)

**Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development
Rural Connectivity Division**


Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 12th November, 2021

Minutes

Subject: Minutes of Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the State Government of Haryana for the 2021-22 (Batch-I)- reg.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on **10th November at 12:00 noon** under the chairmanship of Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Haryana under PMGSY III for the year 2021-22 (Batch-I).

2. It is requested that a compliance report on all the observations of the committee may be sent to Ministry/NRIDA.


(N.G. Virmayai)
Assistant Commissioner

Distribution:

- I. Sh. Alok Nigam, Additional Chief Secretary cum Vice President, HaRRIDA Room No. 306, 3rd Floor, New Secretariate, Sector-17, Chandigarh – 160017
- II. Sh. Nihal Singh, Secretary General, HaRRIDA 1st Floor, Nirman Sadan, Plot No. 1, Sector-33A, Chandigarh – 160020
- III. Sh. P.K. Dhaka, Executive Director- cum- Chief Engineer, HaRRIDA 2 nd Floor, Nirman Sadan, Sector-33 A, Chandigarh – 160020
- IV. All Directors, NRIDA

Copy for information to:-

PPS to JS (RC)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 10th NOVEMBER, 2021 AT 12:00 NOON TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF HARYANA UNDER PMGSY III (BATCH I), 2021-22

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee was held through Video Conference on 10th November, 2021 at 12:00 Noon under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary, Department of Rural Development & DG, NRIDA to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Haryana under PMGSY III (Batch I) of 2021-22. Following officials were present in the meeting.

Shri Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA
Shri. B C Pradhan	Consultant (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Dr. I.K.Pateriya	Director (P.II&III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agarwal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
Shri Lalit Kumar	Deputy Secretary (RC), MoRD
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri Nihal Singh	CEO-cum-Secretary General, HaRRIDA
Shri B.S. Khokar	SE-cum-SQC, HaRRIDA
Shri Varun Gupta	Executive Engineer, HaRRIDA
Shri R.P. Gulati	Financial Controller, HaRRIDA
Shri Rahul	ITNO, HaRRIDA

2. Current Proposal by the State:

A detailed presentation on the proposal submitted by the State of Haryana under Batch-I of 2021-22 was made by the NRIDA before the Pre-Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:-

As per State's proposal dated 20.10.2021					As per OMMAS as on 09.11.2021			
Item	No of Roads	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)	No of Roads	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)
Up-gradation	59	621.43	328.71	52.90	59	621.43	325.05	52.31
Bridges	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	59	621.43	328.71	52.90	59	621.43	325.05*	52.31
*MoRD Share : Rs. 192.06 Crore State Share : Rs. 132.99 Crores								

I. The State of Haryana has been allocated target length of 2,500 Km under PMGSY-III. The State has already been sanctioned 1,906 Km road length and 594 Km is balance for sanction. The current proposal is for 59 roads of 621.43 Km at an estimated cost of Rs. 328.71 crore (Central Share-Rs.192.06 crore and State share- 132.99 crore), which is 27.31 Km more than

the balance target length. The State needs to downsize the proposal as per the target.

II. All the proposals have been uploaded and scrutinized by STAs on OMMAS. No proposal has been scrutinized by PTA, which should be done before the EC.

III. Out of 59 roads, the state has proposed 5 roads of 7.0 m carriageway width (59.04 km) at average cost of 50.41 lakh/km, 52 roads of 5.5 m carriageway width (528.51 km) at average cost of Rs 49.88 lakh/km, 2 roads of 3.66 m carriageway width (33.90 Km) at an average cost of Rs 93.57 lakh/km.

IV. The NRIDA was asked to include details and outcome of scrutiny done by the STA and PTA in future presentation of proposals.

3. Length wise proposal details

All the 59 roads proposed in the current batch are of 5 Km and above as per the following details:-

Sl No	Items	No of roads	Length in km	Pavement cost	Cost/km	Total cost in crores	Average cost/km
1	5 km and above	59	621.43	250.44	40.30	325.05	52.31
	Total	59	621.43	250.44	40.30	326.14	52.31

The average length of candidate road is 15.58 Km and average length of proposed road is 10.53 Km.

4. Existing surface details

Brick soling	Track	Gravel	WBM	BT	CC	Total
-	-	-	-	587.04	34.39	621.43

The existing surface of all the road proposed in the current batch are either BT or CC.

5. Traffic wise details of road

(i) In 3.75 m carriageway width, 2 roads of 33.90 Km are in T7 category with average cost of Rs. 93.57 lakh/Km.

(ii) In 5.50 m carriageway width, 31 roads of 353.65 km are in T7 category with average cost Rs 43.82 lakh/Km.

(iii) In 5.50 m carriageway width, 21 roads 174.85 km are in T9 category with average cost Rs 62.12 lakh/Km.

(iv) In 7.00 m carriageway width, 02 roads of length 23.48 km are in T7 category with average cost Rs 42.38 lakh/Km.

(v) In 7.00 m carriageway width, 02 roads of length 27.95 km are in T9 category with average cost of Rs. 53.88 lakh/km.

(vi) In 7.00 m carriageway width, 01 road of length 7.61 km is in more than 2 MSA category with average cost Rs 62.42 lakh/Km.

6. Average cost trends

i) The Committee observed that the average cost of roads of 5.50 m carriageway width has increased from 45.59 lakh/km in Batch-II of 2020-21 to 49.88 lakh/km in the current batch. The State/NRIDA was asked to review these proposals. The State/NRIDA was also asked to analyze the proposal involving widening and strengthening and those requiring only strengthening as separate groups.

ii) There are 17 roads in 5.50 m carriageway width category with pavement cost more than 50 lakh/km. The State was asked to explore the possibility of use of new and green technology on these roads so as to reduce the pavement cost (e.g. stabilized base)

iii) 2 roads of 33.90 Km have been proposed in Panchkula District, with average cost of Rs. 93.57 lakh/Km and non-pavement cost of Rs. 72.24 lakh/Km. The State representative informed that these two roads are in tourist destinations in hilly areas at the border of Haryana with Himachal Pradesh. The State was advised to adopt new technology on these roads, both in pavement and protection works. Further, NRIDA was asked to depute a team (including representative from CRRI if possible), which can advice the state on use of suitable engineering measures so as to showcase the road and also reduce non-pavement cost.

iv) The State representative intimated during the meeting that the State is using Cold Technology in maintenance of patch works. The State was asked to share the literature/ write-up on the same with NRIDA/Ministry for wider dissemination.

7. Planning

(i) Trace Map Cut-Quality of roads

Min. Trace Map Rank	Numbers of Proposals	%
1 to 15	45	76.27%
16 to 50	11	18.64%
51 to 100	2	3.39%
>100	1	1.69%
Total	59	

With regard 3 proposals with Trace Map Rank more than 50, the State representative intimated that these are inter-state roads connecting Punjab (1 road) and Rajasthan (2 roads). The State was asked to submit road-wise justification as to how these roads meet PMGSY-III objectives.

(ii) Planning Audit (Proposals)

- All 59 proposals were audited for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III on GeoSadak.
- Subsequently, result of planning audit was communicated and the State has rectified the observations raised in the Audit.
- Further, 3 proposals need justifications/ modifications as how they meet PMGSY-III objectives.

District Name	Block name	Work Name
Rewari	Khol At Rewari	T05-mandola to Zainabad via Dhawana
Jind	Pillukhera	T09-Pillukhera Mandi to Bhairo Khera via Dhaurli, Bhartana, Lalit Khera
Sirsa	Ellenabad	T11-Chilkani Dhab to Kuttabadh via Mehna Khera

8. High priority roads skipped in CUCPL

143 High Priority roads have been skipped in CUCPL due to various reasons. Of these, 21 roads have been skipped on the ground that ownership of these roads is with different department. The State was asked to give detailed justification for skipping these roads. Mere ownership can not be the justification for skipping them. Evidence should be produced if the other department has taken them up for upgradation, otherwise they can not be left out.

9. Proposals With Good Existing Surfaces

3 proposals were identified with Good Existing Surface, which have been proposed for upgradation. Proposals with majority surface in good condition (PCI>3) are not eligible under PMGSY-III. The State representative intimated that old photographs in respect of these roads were inadvertently uploaded and now new photographs are being uploaded. The State was asked to drop these roads or furnish justification road-wise with geo-tagged videos/photographs.

10. General/DPR issues

- a. State should provide a copy of SLSC approval, MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats and consent letters of Hon'ble MPs on final proposal.
- b. Proper transect walk photographs, transect walk summary/ Minutes, and copy of Gram Sabha's approval are not attached to most of the DPRs & need to be attached with the DPRs.
- c. State should certify that the roads proposed in current batch have completed the design life of 10 years.

- d. State should ensure that the required land width is available to provide 7.50 m and 9 m top width for 3.75 m & 5.50m carriageway as per IRC guidelines. **Further, State should ensure that the existing CDs are widened to 9 m width for 5.50 m width roads. However, the State has indicated 7.3 m top width for 5.50 m carriageway width roads. This situation needs to be clarified and examined in detail.**
- e. 3rd party traffic verification as per recent advisory should be done by the State for design traffic considered more than 1 MSA and the reports should be attached with the DPRs (24 roads). Reports need to be provided to NRIDA for verification.
- f. State should ensure that the design stage RSA has been done for all the proposed candidate roads and the reports should be attached with the DPRs. Sample reports need to be provided for verification.
- g. State should propose roads with FDR technology and/or cement/other stabilized base/sub-base where the average pavement cost/km is on the higher side.
- h. The test results for GSB, carted earth, and shoulder materials are not found attached to the DPRs.
- i. Earth work quantity seems to be on the higher side. Needs to be rationalized.
- j. Length of existing/ proposed slab culverts/ box culverts, causeway portion needs to be deducted from the pavement quantity to avoid duplication of quantities in pavement length.
- k. State should follow the overlay thickness as per clause 2.2.3 of IRC:SP:72:2015.
- l. BM of 50mm thickness and BC has been provided for T9 traffic category roads. PC & SC should be proposed in place of BC as per code. ((HR16-III-304).
- m. In some of the DPRs profile correction has been proposed more than 30% which should be rationalized (e.g. Package no HR16-III-304)
- n. In some of the DPRs, as per the attached photographs in the DPR and OMMAS, existing condition of the road is in fair condition. According to PMGSY-III guidelines, road with PCI>3 doesn't qualify for up-gradation neither for riding quality improvement. State should reconsider the proposal.
- o. Stabilized sub base thickness should be proposed as per design chart Fig 6 of IRC SP:72:2015. However, State has proposed 150 mm instead of 100 mm. Needs to be corrected (HR17-III-301).
- p. State has not proposed prime coat over WBM/ WMM surface. Needs to be provided.
- q. Quantities for junctions should be rationalized.
- r. Cost of CD works are on the higher side due to the provision of box culvert. State should explore the possibility of proposing RCC Slab culvert in place of box culvert, wherever possible (HR15-III-302).
- s. Drain should be proposed in built-up areas and pucca side drain proposed in open area needs to be deleted/ justified.
- t. Thermoplastic road marking width for edge line has been taken as 150mm. It shall be reduced to 100mm. This provision shall be made only in vulnerable portions.
- u. Locations of road safety measures & road furniture should be provided in the road plan with proper justifications and quantities should be rationalized as per the actual site conditions.
- v. State should ensure that the cost towards utility shifting, electric pole shifting is added under Higher Specification cost in OMMAS.

11. Maintenance

State has proposed Rs.2,268.54 Lakh (6.96% of the construction cost) for 5 years routine maintenance cost and Rs. 10,763.22 Lakh (33% of the construction cost) for 6th year Renewal cost, which were found agreeable. 5 years routine maintenance cost after 6th year's renewal needs to be included in the DPRs.

12. R&D Proposals

Sl.No	Name of Technology	No of stretches/ roads	Length(in km)	Percentage of R& D roads with respect to total length
A	Main streaming of Technologies			
1	Waste Plastic	55	529.34	85.18%
	Sub Total	55	529.34	
B	Other Main Streaming technologies			
	CC Block	1	0.62	0.10%
	Sub Total	1	0.62	
C	IRC Accredited Technology			
1	Nano Technology	9	73.80	11.88%
	Total	65	603.76	97.16%

State should confirm Nano technology water proofing are not proposed only in BT layer. Nano technology only in Tack coat and BT layer is not encouraged. This should be for structural layers.

State has proposed 58.70 km with CC pavement. State should propose these roads using Cell Filled Concrete/ Panelled Cement Concrete/ ICBP/ Cement Concrete Block/ roller compacted concrete. Such roads/ stretches needs to be uploaded under new technology to the full extent of 100%.

State was also asked to explore construction of at least 50% road length of T7 category roads using mechanized surface dressing. SD can be used in T7 category roads as per IRC Code.

The State was asked to explore use of new technology in bigger proportion. The State was also advised to conduct a webinar with the various technology providers (before EC) to discuss and ascertain best suited and economical technology for the State and propose the same accordingly, and upload on OMMAS before the EC.

State should also propose some of the roads with cold mix technology in Bituminous Macadam layer.

13. Progress of PMGSY works

The status of implementation of PMGSY-I, II and III in the State are as under:-

S.No	Scheme	Sanctioned		Completed		Balance		Unawarded	
		Nos.	Length (Km)	Nos.	Length (Km)	No. of Roads	Length (km)	No. of Roads	Length (km)
1.	PMGSY I	426	4,572.10	426	4,565.22	0	0.00	-	-
2.	PMGSY-II	88	1,042.23	88	1,015.74	0	0.00	-	-
3.	PMGSY-III	203	1,905.88	47	1,127.22	157	774.82	-	-
Total:		717	7,520.22	560	6,708.19	157	774.82	-	-

Bridge (No.)

Sl.No	SCHEME	Sanction (Nos.)	Completed (Nos.)	Balance (Nos.)	Unaward (Nos.)
1.	PMGSY I	0	0	-	-
2.	PMGSY II	18	18	-	-
3.	PMGSY-III	0	0	-	-
Total:		18	18	-	-

14. Maintenance of roads under DLP

As per the figures indicated by the State Government, against maintenance liability of Rs. 27.57 crore, Rs. 25.08 crore received in SRRDA account and Rs. 23.10 crore incurred. There is mismatch in the figures reported by the State and those available on OMMAS. The State representative assured that the state will look into these issues and will take the corrective steps.

15. Renewal length status

There was mismatch in the renewal length data. The State was asked to submit their data so that both the data could be depicted on OMMAS.

16. Quality

I. 148 packages are presently in progress and in 15 packages QC lab details are not uploaded on OMMAS. The State representative intimated that QC lab has already been in r/o 10 works and in 5 cases, it will be done shortly.

II. Unsatisfactory % based on NQM inspections (October, 2018-October,2021) -

- Completed Works - 0.0 % - 5 Completed works inspected
- Ongoing Works -0.76% - 131 Ongoing works inspected
- Maintenance works -17.02% - 47 Maintenance Works Inspected

III. Pending ATRs at State level:-

- Ongoing Works - 02

IV. Anomalies of SQM Inspections:-

- i. Inadequate pit size excavated for determination of Bituminous layer thickness. (HR-20111-09).
- ii. No Inspection Photograph uploaded. (HR-22-111-10, HR-7-111-10, HR-08-111-01)
- iii. Inspection conducted in dark, moreover meaningless photographs are uploaded (HR16-III-12, HR21-III-01, HR09-III-06).
- iv. Camber is checked without camber rod and level tube (HR16-III-08).
- v. This SQM has uploaded all photographs clicked from report (HR09-III-06, HR21-III-01, HR16-III-06).
- vi. Inadequate field lab is graded as 'Satisfactory'(HR16-III-02).
- vii. Shoulders are not properly maintained still rated Satisfactory by SQM. (HR0111-04, HR0111-17).

The Quality of SQM inspection needs improvement. The State was advised to organize the training/orientation programme for the SQMS.

17. Pre- Empowered Committee suggested the state to 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.
