

No.P-17024/4/2019-RC (Part) (FMS No. 368978)

Government of India

Ministry of Rural Development

Department of Rural Development

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi

Dated the 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2021

**MINUTES**

**Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Bihar under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) for the 2020-21 (Batch-I)-reg.**

The undersigned is directed to forward herewith the Minutes of the Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> March, 2021 at 3.00 PM under the chairmanship of Joint Secretary (RC) and DG (NRIDA) through Video Conferencing to discuss the project proposals for Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) for the year 2020-21 (Batch-I) for information and necessary action.

2. State is requested to furnish the compliance of the Pre-EC to Ministry/NRIDA for conducting the EC on time.

Encl:- As above.

  
(Kirti Gupta) 18/3

Under Secretary to the Government of India

Tele No: 011- 23071326

**Distribution:**

(i) The Secretary, RWD, Govt. of Bihar, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Vishveshwariya Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna-800015.

(ii) The Chief Engineer, RWD, Govt. of Bihar, Vishveshwariya Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna-800015.

(iii) Shri Bhagwat Ram, Nodal Officer, PMGSY, SRRDA, RWD, Govt. of Bihar, Vishveshwariya Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna- 800015.

(iv) All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066.

**Copy for information to:-**

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

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 10<sup>th</sup> March, 2021 AT 3:00 PM TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT UNDER PHASE-I OF PMGSY-III (2020-21)**

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (RC) was held through Video Conference on **10<sup>th</sup> March, 2020 at 3:00 PM** under the Chairpersonship of Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA to consider the project proposal submitted by the State of Bihar under PMGSY-III (Batch-I) of 2020-21. Following officials were present in the meeting.

<b>Central Govt. Representative</b>	
Dr Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary, (RC), MoRD
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
<b>State Govt. Representatives</b>	
Sh. Pankaj Kumar Pal	Secretary-cum-CEO, BRRDA
Sh. Bhagwat Ram	Nodal Officer PMGSY, BRRDA
Md. Nurul En Ishrat	SQC, BRRDA
Sh. Kumar Rajeev Ranjan	EE, PMGSY, BRRDA
Sh. Ashok Kumar	EE, PMGSY, BRRDA
Sh. Prabhat Kumar	Financial Manger, BRRDA

**2. Details of Proposal**

Item	As per States letter dated 25.2.2021				As per OMMAS dated 08.3.2021			
	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	101	877.40	831.53	94.77	134	1108.53	965.68	87.11
LSBs	28	670.10	34.57	5.15	34	783.19	42.20	5.39
Total	101 roads 28 LSBs	877.40 km roads 670.10 m LSBs	866.10		134 roads 34 LSBs	1108.53 km roads 783.19 m LSBs	1007.88	

**\*MoRD Share : Rs. 601.18 Crore**  
**Target : 6162.50 km**

**State share : Rs 406.70 Crore**  
**Sanctioned: NIL**

\*State has not proposed any higher specification cost in roads despite provision in guidelines.

3.75 m width road- 89 Nos & Length – 659.86 km - Rs. 65.64 Lakhs/km  
5.50 m width road – 45 Nos & Length- 448.67 km – Rs. 118.70 Lakhs/km

All Proposals have been scrutinized by STAs, however, PTA has not scrutinized any proposals on OMMAS. Scrutiny of further proposals is said to be in progress at STA level. It was informed that the state has sent DPRs of around 2200 Km to STAs for scrutiny.

State should make efforts for uploading and completing details of only those proposals as they can do within the next 3-4 days and these should be scrutinized by STAs so that the same may be considered in the current FY. State should send selected proposals to PTA for scrutiny on priority basis.

Average cost of Rs. 118.70 lakh/km for 5.50 m roads as proposed by Bihar is much higher in comparison to other states. For cost rationalization, the State should examine all the proposals/ DPR.

### 3. DPR issues

- Transect walk summary/Minutes and copy of Gram Sabha approval have not been attached in the DPRs.
- STA has given the following remarks and the same needs to be incorporated in the DPRs-
  - Rate analysis should be modified with lesser use of machinery.
  - Portland Pozzolona Cement should be used in Paneled cement concrete pavement.
- As per PMGSY-III guidelines, road safety audit should be done on all roads with a length of 5 km & more.
- State is providing 50 mm in WBM for potholes repair and profile correction throughout the upgradation length and needs to be rationalized as per actual requirement only. The state had proposed 50% length for such provision in PMGSY-II only, but it was disallowed at that time also.
- State has proposed 50mm BM followed with SDBC as bituminous overlay in 51 roads having traffic T-7 category (42 nos with 5.5 m carriage way and 9 nos with 3.75 m carriageway) violating the design requirement based on IRC SP 72:2015. This needs to be corrected as per requirement.
- For roads having traffic T-5 category, surface dressing need to be provided instead of OGPC and seal coat.
- The State has proposed Tack coat twice in all the proposals. It should be restricted to one coat only.
- The overlay need to be designed as per clause 2.2.3 of SP: 72-2015 considering the existing crust available.
- The cost of T-5 category roads (of 3.75m) is unusually very high, even more than T-7 category roads. This needs proper examination. Cost of 5.5 m roads (category T-6, T-7) is very high. Non-pavement cost is also very high in general in all the proposals. State should examine/ justify why there is so much difference between pavement cost (65.55 L/km) and average cost (86.64 L/km) of two roads of T5 category. This is to be re-examined. There is an abnormal increase in the cost of proposals compared to the cost sanctioned in 2019-20 under PMGSY-II (almost 17%)
- Tree plantation charges are not permitted from the programme fund. Needs to be deleted from the DPR. This should come from MGNREGS or other sources, which will not be a part of DPRs.



- 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.
- In some DPRs, the provision of CC pavement and CD's is on higher side and the same needs to be re-assessed. Proper credit needs to be given to the existing CC road, considering its design life and load bearing capacity.
- During discussion SE cum Nodal Officer PMGSY, BRRDA explained that BM and SDBC has been provided as overlay to the existing BT surface without scarification whose surface condition is in good condition as scarification of existing BT would loose about 50-75 mm granular base-course. But while scrutinizing the sample DPRs of 20 roads sent for scrutiny, in all the 9 DPRs proposed for 5.5 m carriageway the provision for scarification of existing BT course followed with WMM overlay of 150 mm and 50 mm BM & SDBC has been made. The state need to verify all such DPRs where provision of BM has been made and follow the guidelines scrupulously.
- The state need to provide adequate length under mainstreaming technology having IRC specifications other than Waste Plastic such as Roller Compacted Concrete Pavement (RCCP), cementious sub-base/ base course, surface dressing, white topping etc.
- The average pavement cost in the districts of Begusarai, Sheohar, Sitamarahi and West Champaran appears to be high due to higher cartage of construction material. To economize the pavement construction cost, appropriate stabilized sub-base/ base can be proposed.

**It was proposed to send a team to SRRDA, Patna from NRIDA to examine the DPRs.**

#### **6. Planning Audit (Satellite Based):-**

Proposals are in-process of being uploaded to GEO SADAK. A sample of 91 proposals was identified by NRIDA and audited for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III. Audit will be completed once all proposals are uploaded on GEOSADAK and result communicated separately

#### **7. Data related proposal checks:-**

In Baisi block of Purnia District, around 12 km CC is again being proposed over existing 12.9 km CC. State should see if existing CC in DLP is being re-proposed and identify economy by use of new technologies. State should provide ATR proposal wise, wherever CC has been proposed.

#### **8. Excess length being proposed:-**

In 16 packages of 16 Districts, proposed length is in excess beyond the eligible CUCPL length. Non-eligible length beyond measurement error is to be moved to higher specification cost. If non-eligible length beyond measurement error is proposed then state should propose this under State's Higher Specification Cost. This needs proper examination.

#### **9. Existing surface:-**

Majority of the proposals have most of their existing surface BT, CC or WBM. 16 proposals with more than 50% existing surface Earthen are in sample for planning audit. This has not been checked yet. NRIDA should examine the proposals.

There is need to re-categorize the existing surface beyond 50% into 50-70%, 70-80%, 80-90% and 90-100%. For the roads which have BT/CC less than 90%, State should furnish justification road wise, as to how these are MRL/ TR for the purpose of PMGSY-III and how much population and facilities are served by these roads, and what is the PCU resulting from traffic survey for these proposed roads.

#### 10. **High priority roads skipped in CUCPL:-**

Transfer to RCD/PWD is the most common reason in "Ownership Category." All the 52 roads which have been excluded due to 'Ownership Issue' may be looked into and included. Exclusion of roads should be justified by giving reasoning by State in each case.

#### 11. **Maintenance:-**

State has proposed Rs 7870.75 lakhs (8.15% of Construction Cost) for 5 years Routine Maintenance and Rs 13157.00 lakhs (13.62% of Construction Cost) for 6<sup>th</sup> year's renewal to be borne by State Govt. The State was advised to increase the 6<sup>th</sup> year's renewal cost to at least 18% of construction cost considering the price escalation. State should also include 5 years routine maintenance cost after 6<sup>th</sup> year's renewal in DPRs.

#### 12. **R&D technology**

State has proposed 452.20 km (40.79%) under Technology with IRC Specification (Mainstreaming Technology) but this is all relating to 'waste plastic'; and 149.93 km (13.53%) under IRC Accredited Materials/Technologies. State need to adopt adequate length under mainstreaming technology other than Waste Plastic also, such as Roller Compacted Concrete, Cement Stabilization, Cell Filled Concrete, surface dressing, white topping etc. Also the state needs to propose adequate length under IRC Accredited technology in respect of soil stabilization and Nanotechnology in the GSB/ Base Course instead of Nanotechnology in bituminous surfacing course. State needs to adopt surface dressing as bituminous wearing course for the roads having traffic T5 and less. These techniques should be used by State with proper vigilance for finding suitable locations.

#### 13. **Governance Issues**

**There are some issues which need to be responded by the State. These are as under:-**

1. Governance related issues like staff strength at SRRDA and PIU level. Whether sufficient staff is available at SRRDA & PIUs corresponding to balance and anticipated work at hand, including roads under maintenance. What are the vacancies at SRRDA/ PIUs and how and when they would be filled? Availability of staff should be commensurate with works in hand and anticipated. The execution and management capacity in terms of staff and infrastructure should be explained and justified. If there are any deficiencies, then measures to ameliorate them should also be spelt out.
2. Strength of technical wing involved in preparation and scrutiny of DPRs. Whether sufficient manpower and expertise exists?
3. Capability for design and execution of bridge works and their supervision during construction.

4. Mechanism of SQM inspections and availability of dedicated expert staff at SRRDA to vet their reports. Whether strength of SQMs is adequate for carrying out required number of inspections as per guidelines, keeping in mind works in progress and new sanctions over the coming years. Separate SQMs should be empaneled for inspection of bridge works. How many staff has been deployed at SRRDA for support of SQC, to analyse the reports of NQMs & SQMs? How effective is the Quality Cell?
5. Forest / Land issues involved in current proposals or previous works in hand.
6. System of contracting: How many days SRRDA is taking in award of sanctioned works and what measures is it taking to reduce the time taken for various processes from the date of sanction to actual publishing of NIT, evaluation, award, agreement, and actual start of work on ground. The state must commit to specific timelines in Pre-EC and EC for these processes.

#### 14. Progress of PMGSY works

State was advised to complete the balance length of roads about 1481.52 kms under PMGSY-I, 1389.94 kms under PMGSY-II and 787.05 km under RCPLWE before March 2022. There are 0.28% Un-awarded roads with reface to total sanctioned roads; this should be looked into by Sate.

#### 15. Maintenance Abstract (as per OMMAS)

Year (s)	Maintenance Liability during Year (Rs. Cr.)	Fund Received (Rs. Cr)	Expenditure (DLP) (Rs. Cr.)
2016-17	190.70	128.41	57.38
2017-18	189.59	262.93	110.22
2018-19	176.63	72.74	105.53
2019-20	178.72	137.21	101.00
2020-21 (as on 09.3.2021)	175.09	0.00	103.32
<b>Total:</b>	<b>910.73</b>	<b>601.29</b>	<b>477.45</b>

It was observed that funds received status is not updated. Hence, State should verify and update the same. Funds which have been received against DLP are to be entered in OMMAS.

#### 16. Renewal Length Status-(Report generated as per OMMAS)

Year (s)	Length due for Renewal (km)	Renewal done during the year (Km)	Centre Share (Rs. Cr.)	State Share (Rs. Cr.)
2016-17	15945.79	551.30	104.73	4.39
2017-18	23009.81	801.24	284.31	0.00
2018-19	28489.58	705.97	-569.42	0.00
2019-20	32564.64	476.28	0.00	0.00
2020-21 (09.03.2021)	36010.16	686.32	0.00	0.00

Entries in renewal length status are not good. State is advised to confirm and update Renewal data. Renewal length and expenditure data seems to mismatch.

#### **17. Quality Control (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Tier)**

##### **Geo referenced field Lab Details in OMMAS (1<sup>st</sup> tier)-**

There are 1376 Packages in Progress. No lab has yet been established in 181 Packages.

##### **Works not inspected by SQM even once (2<sup>nd</sup> tier)**

There are total involved works are 1330, out of which 35 have not been inspected by SQM and payment has been made to 8 SQMs. There are 11 disputed works.

There are 115 SQMs active as per OMMAS and 155 more are to be needed. For the FY 2020-21, target for SQM inspections is 2646 and till date 2564 SQM inspections have been conducted.

32 ATRs against completed work and 82 ATRs against ongoing work are pending with state which needs to be submitted by the State immediately. Pending complaints at state level are 03. The State needs to improve the quality of SQM inspections; they should hold an orientation workshop of SQMs, to be chaired by CEO.

**There are some anomalies in SQM inspections reports carried out in during 2020-21, which needs to be rectified by State:-**

- Photographs & report are not uploaded on OMMAS and many roads graded as satisfactory.
- No test conducted, only general photographs uploaded on OMMAS and road are graded as satisfactory.
- Gradation test is not conducted and field lab photographs not uploaded for ongoing road and the road graded as satisfactory.
- Same photos uploaded multiple times.
- Super elevations checked at straight portion not at curve.
- Inadequate pit size excavated for determination of BT layer thickness.
- Unnecessary photographs are uploaded and road graded satisfactory.
- Hume pipes are clogged and the road is graded as satisfactory.

#### **18. Fund Position**

State should look into the following points with regard to financial matters and take action to resolve the same:-

- i. 26 work pending for financial closure for more than 180 days as on 09-03-2021.
- ii. Recovery of short credit of bank interest is still pending.
- iii. State is to submit PMGSY financial reconciliation report on priority basis.
- iv. Details of Bank account required for configuration in online EMD system.
- v. State has not submitted Maintenance Fund Balance Sheet for FY 2019-20.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

A handwritten signature or mark, possibly a stylized 'S' or 'V', located at the bottom right of the page.