

No. P-17024/12/2021-RC (FMS No 374852)

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

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 23rd June, 2021

Minutes

Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee (Examination of Proposals) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Jharkhand for Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) (Batch-I, 2021-22)-reg.

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on 4th June, 2021 through Video Conferencing (VC ID No. 3473246748) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Jharkhand for Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) (Batch-I, 2021-22) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action.

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


(Kirti Gupta) 23/6

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India

Distribution:

- i. The Secretary, Rural Works Department-cum-Chief Executive Office, Jharkhand State Rural Roads Development Authority, F.F.P Building, 2nd Floor, Dhurwa, Ranchi- 834004
- ii. Shri Jay Prakash Singh, Chief Engineer, JSRRDA
- iii. All Directors in NRIDA.

Copy to:-

PS to Secretary (RD)/ PPS to AS& FA/PPS to AS (RD)/PPS to JS (RC)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 4th June, 2021 AT 4.30 PM TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSALS UNDER Batch-I OF PMGSY-III (2021-22)

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (RC) was held through Video Conference on 4th June, 2021 at 4.30 PM under the Chairpersonship of Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Jharkhand under PMGSY-III (Batch-I) of 2021-22. Following officials were present in the meeting: -

Central Govt. Representatives	
Dr Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary, (RC), MoRD& DG (NRIDA)
Shri K.M.Singh	Deputy Secretary (RC), MoRD
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
State Govt. Representatives	
Dr. Manish Ranjan	Secretary-cum-CEO, RWD, Jharkhand
Shri Ashok Kumar	SQC, JSRRDA
Shri Praveen Kumar Jha	Nodal Officer, JSRRDA
Shri Surender Prasad	EE, JSRRDA
Shri SobodhPaswan	AE, JSRRDA
Shri Dinesh Pradhan	Finance Controller, JSRRDA
Shri Manish Keshri	IT Nodal Officer, JSRRDA

1. Details of the Proposals :-

Item	As per OMMAS dated 03.6.2021			
	No	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km (Lakhs)
Roads	110	1027.894	762.48	74.18

***MoRD Share: Rs. 457.49 Crore**
Target : 4125 km

State Share: Rs 304.99 Crore
Sanctioned : NIL

(i) 87 roads of 752.46 km length are of 3.75 m width with average cost of Rs. 65.17 Lakhs/km and 23 roads with 275.43 km are of 5.50 m width with average cost of Rs. 98.80 Lakhs/km. Track roads are proposed for a length of 77.03 kms. All proposals are uploaded and scrutinised by the STAs on OMMAS. Scrutiny of the proposals is to be carried out by PTA. It was advised to send the proposals to PTA (IIT Bhubaneshwar) for scrutiny.

(ii) NRIDA informed that proposals uploaded by State are not as per priority. State has excluded higher priority roads and has proposed roads of lower priority without giving any reason. They have

bypassed system checks by adding all high priority proposals till OMMAS allowed them to reach the proposal of choice and then deleted all the previously entered proposals. Proposals should only be in order of priority as per guidelines. This is a very serious issue, and proposals which do not follow guidelines cannot be accepted.

(iii) CUCPL of all the blocks has this issue. State was informed that in CUCPL, roads are to be chosen as per priority. If any road is to be left, there should be a viable reason as per guidelines.

(iv) State clarified that higher priority roads have been left due to the reasons that some of these roads are being constructed by other Departments, or the roads are in maintenance period or have forest issue etc. It was explained that any exclusions of higher priority road have to be substantiated with documentary evidence by the. State assured to do so.

2. Planning Audit (CUCPL)

(i) Regarding the audit of the candidate road mapping, 147 blocks have generated CUCPL, out of which 127 blocks were checked by NRIDA in March, 2021. NRIDA agreed for taking up for only 45 blocks in this batch as the rest have serious planning issues. However, 1 block of Garhwa Sadar (Garhwa) which is still in this proposal, needs to be removed since generation of CUCPL was not done as per guidelines. State assured to exclude the 1 block of Garhwa Sadar (Garhwa).

(ii) State was asked to rectify the remaining rejected blocks. Rejected blocks need to be audited again after rectification on priority else this will delay future proposals.

(iii) State has requested for deputing 2-3 experts from NRIDA for completion of entire process. NRIDA assured to provide support for resolving the issues by holding a webinar with the State. It was however mentioned that the state has been given hand holding several times and senior officers from the state need to take ownership of the process.

3. Target Distribution Strategy

NRIDA informed that state has not submitted their strategy for target distribution within the State. Fairness should be ensured and preference may be given to Aspirational Districts. State informed that they have committed for target of average 20-25 km per block. State needs to examine it and communicate the same formally.

4. Planning Audit (Satellite Based)

NRIDA told that at the time of verification, most proposals were not finalized on GEOSADAK. 23 out of 100 are still pending. Sample verification on high trace map, earthen roads and low CUCPL will be conducted post upload of remaining proposals. State was advised to upload & approve all alignments as per DPR on GEOSADAK.



During the meeting, this was highlighted that without having proper data, Pre-EC is premature and not justified. State was advised to ensure that before meeting all the information is sent well in advance. NRIDA should verify these proposals and communicate the results to the state.

5. Anomaly in T9 and 5.5 category roads

NRIDA pointed out that for one proposal on GeoSADAK with T9 traffic category, 5.5 m width (Bokaro Petawar MRL02) is there but this road has no elements such as highly irrigated area, connecting major roads, mining, industry or large habitation which suggest heavy traffic on this road. It was also stated that this road does not appear as Through Route or Major Rural Link. Hence, there is need for justification from State to propose T9 category with 5.5 m width for this road. State was advised to re-look all the proposed T9 roads.

6. CC Length Re-Proposing

About 8 works have the same existing CC length with proposed CC length. CC cost per km is also high which reflects that State is replacing the existing CC roads. The CC roads which are under DLP shouldn't be proposed. State should correct the same. If any upgradation is required, proper justification and credit to existing pavement should be given.

7. Non-Eligible Length Proposed

In 5 works of 5 districts, proposed length is in excess beyond the eligible CUCPL length. State has to submit road-wise justification of excess length proposed or drop the excess length or consider the cost under state share.

8. Existing Surfaces

Majority of the proposals are in existing BT/CC or WBM condition. 14 proposals with more than 75% existing surface Earthen. State to send detailed road wise justifications for 14 proposals as how they meet PMGSY-III definition of TR/MRL.

9. DPR Issues

- i. Independent third-party traffic survey on the roads of more than 1 MSA through ATCC are not provided by the state. Without traffic survey DPRs can not be accepted for higher category roads.
- ii. Transect walk summary/Minutes and copy of Gram Sabha approval are attached to the DPRs. NRIDA will check on random basis.
- iii. Road safety audit of all candidate roads should be included in the proposal.
- iv. State needs to give work order for ATCC survey for traffic accessibility, this has been unduly delayed. **State was advised to exclude T9 roads from existing proposal.**

- v. The overlay needs to be designed as per clause 2.2.3 of SP: 72-2015 considering the existing crust available.
- vi. In some DPRs, CBR of the existing crust is less than 5%, therefore as per IRC SP:72 2015, the existing crust should be stabilized to achieve a minimum design CBR of 5% in the portion wherever possible. State needs to intimate the details of these roads.
- vii. Existing/proposed slab culverts portion is deducted in pavement quantity to avoid duplication of quantities.
- viii. Lump sum amount of 20% to 30% extra quantity in WBM for potholes and profile correction need to be revised. Actual quantity instead of lump sum quantity needs to be incorporated as per the ground requirement and it may not exceed 8 to 10% for profile correction including filling of potholes and patches after scarification.
- ix. State needs to scrutinize all the DPRs from STA and 10% DPRs from the PTA.
- x. Proforma -C is corrected during STA vetting process, NRIDA is to check on random basis.
- xi. The 6th year renewal cost is 10.333 % which is low. State needs to reassess this and to confirm that 5-year maintenance followed with post 6th year renewal is included.
- xii. The state needs to justify the higher average cost in case of 5.5 m carriageway in the districts of Garwha and Khunti.
- xiii. In case of 3.75 m carriageway the reason of higher average cost/ km in the district of Chatra, Garwha, Khunti and Pakur is required from the state.

10. R&D technology

State has not proposed any road length under main-stream technology. As per mandatory ruling, State has to propose at least 10 % of road length under mainstream technology such as RCCP, stabilized sub-base/base etc and 5 % of road length under IRC accredited technology. Besides this state need to propose adequate length using plastic waste as main streaming technology.

11. Maintenance

State informed that Rs. 300 crores have been allocated under DLP budget. State was asked to release funds under DLP to SRRDA's account and upload the data on OMMAS and Google sheet.

12. It was again pointed out the State has not uploaded its data on OMMAS. It is still in process of identifying the proposed roads. Hence, it will be appropriate to hold a pre-EC for PMGSY-III again after compliance and resolving all the observations and issues raised during this meeting including road safety and traffic survey. NRIDA was asked to communicate all these issues and observations to State for their compliance. This meeting should be treated as 'examination of proposals' rather than Pre-EC.

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

