

File No-P-17024/5/2019-RC (E-365906)

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

Room No.376
Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated: 24th November, 2021


MINUTES

Subject: Minutes of the Meeting of Pre- Empowered Committee held on 12th November, 2021 to discuss project proposals of State of Chhattisgarh under Road Connectivity Project in Left Wing Extremism Areas (RCPLWEA) (Batch-I, 2021-22)-reg.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on 12th November, 2021 at 02:30 PM under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA (through Video Conferencing) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State of Chhattisgarh under RCPLWEA (Batch-I, 2021-22).

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

Encl. as above



(K.M Singh)

Deputy Secretary to the Government of India
Tel: 011-23070308

Distribution:

- i. Shri Siddharth Komal Singh Pardeshi, IAS, The Secretary (PWD), New Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh- 492002
- ii. Shri Vijay Kumar Bhatpahari, The Engineer-in-chief, New Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh- 492002
- iii. Shri G.R. Rawte, Chief Engineer, New Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh- 492002
- iv. Shri Nishant Kumar Mishra, Deputy Secretary (LWE), North Block, MHA, New Delhi- 110001
- v. All Directors of NRIDA

Copy to:-

► PS to Secretary (RD)/PPS to AS (RD)/PPS to JS (RC)

Minutes of the Meeting of Pre- Empowered Committee held on 12th November, 2021 to discuss project proposals of State of Chhattisgarh under RCPLWEA (Batch-I, 2021-22)

A meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee was held on 12th November, 2021 at 02:30 PM through VC under the chairmanship of Joint Secretary (RC), DG NRIDA to consider the project proposals of State of Chhattisgarh under RCPLWEA (Batch-I, 2021-22).

The following officials were present in the meeting: -

MoRD/ NRIDA representatives	
Dr. Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary (RC) & DG (NRIDA)
Shri K.M. Singh	Deputy Secretary (RC)
Ms. Anjali Yadav	Assistant Director (RC)
Shri BC Pradhan	Director, (Technical) NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agrawal	Director (Projects-I), NRIDA
Dr. IK Pateriya	Director (Projects-II/ III), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
MHA Representative	
Shri Nishant Kumar Mishra	Deputy Secretary (LWE)
State Government representatives	
Shri Siddharth Komal Singh Pardeshi	Secretary, Chhattisgarh PWD
Shri Vijay Kumar Bhatpahari	Engineer-in-Chief, PWD
Shri S.N. Srivastava	Deputy Secretary, Chhattisgarh PWD
Shri G.R. Rawate	Chief Engineer, PWD
Shri B.S. Baghel	Chief Engineer, PWD
Shri P.M. Kashyap	Chief Engineer, PWD

2. The details of the proposal of the State Govt. under RCPLWEA, Batch-I of 2021-22 are as under: -

Item	As per OMMAS dated 12.8.2021			
	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)
Roads	80	392.90	221.87	56.46
LSBs	28	3234.10	160.74	4.97
Total	80 roads &28 LSBs	392.90 km roads &3234.10 m LSBs	382.61	

***MoRD Share : Rs. 229.57 Crore**

State Share: Rs 153.04 Crore

General Observation:

- i. The State of Chhattisgarh has been recommended an additional proposal of 104 roads and 16 LSBs by Ministry of Home Affairs. The current proposal is for 80 roads of 392.90 Km and 28 LSBs at an estimated cost of Rs. 382.61 crore (Central Share- Rs. 229.57 crore and State share- Rs. 153.04 crore).
- ii. Out of the proposed 80 roads, 7 roads were recommended by MHA in 2019-20 and 73 roads were out of those approved in 2020-21.
- iii. It is to reiterate that 104 roads and 16 LSBs were recommended by MHA in June 2020, out of which state has proposed for only 73 roads and 13 LSBs. State informed that the remaining 31 roads and 3 LSBs are not feasible. ***15 LSBs have been proposed on the roads sanctioned earlier. This should be confirmed from previous EC minutes, whether they were indicated at the time of proposal of roads. It should also be confirmed whether LSBs would be required in the 80 roads currently proposed.***
- iv. MHA representative mentioned that out of these 31 roads, 11 roads hold strategic importance from the LWE perspective and are mandatory to be constructed under RCPLWEA, otherwise the very purpose of the scheme may be defeated. State representative explained that these 11 roads lie in extremely LWE areas. State officials are in coordination with the security forces and getting the DPRs made and ensured that the proposal for these roads will be submitted soon. It was mentioned that the proposals are abnormally delayed, hence the state needs to expedite the process of submission of proposals, otherwise it'll be difficult for the state to complete them by March 2023. ***MHA was asked to formally communicate with the Ministry regarding their approval/objection for dropping of the remaining 20 roads. The state should also formally inform the Ministry as to why these 20 roads are being dropped and how they have been taken up in other scheme of the state government.***
- v. Further, 8 roads of 146 km have been recently recommended by MHA to the state on 13th October 2021. State was asked to come up with the proposals of these 8 roads along with 11 roads (recommended in June 2020) latest by 30th November 2021. Pre-EC meeting will be conducted for these works and thereafter EC meeting for the entire proposal (80 + 11+ 8 roads) could be held together, so as to save time.
- vi. In the current proposal, 71 roads of 327.18 km length are of 3.75 m width with average cost of Rs. 53.97 Lakhs/km and 9 roads with 65.73 km are of 5.50 m width with average cost of Rs. 68.87 Lakhs/km.
- vii. 9 roads of 65.73 km having 5.5 m carriageway width and average cost Rs. 68.87 lakh/ km have PCU more than 5000/ day as per proforma C which seems to be very high. ***State needs to check if traffic survey has been properly done in these 9 roads and it represents the actual no. of vehicles passing through these roads.***
- viii. All proposals have been uploaded and scrutinized by the STAs on OMMAS. PTA has not scrutinized any proposal on OMMAS. State should ensure that PTA scrutiny is done before EC meeting and the observations of PTA should be complied in all the remaining DPRs.

3. Status of RCPLWEA (Additional) Proposals -2020-21

It was observed that in their proposal June 2020, MHA had recommended only 16 LSBs however the state has proposed 28 LSBs. State clarified that they have taken 13 LSBs out of these 16 recommended by MHA which are stand alone bridges and have proposed 15 others which lie on the same alignment of roads being taken up. State was asked to give the distribution of 28 LSBs proposed by them. Committee observed that state should clearly bring out the clear requirements of LSBs on the alignment of 80 roads proposed, else in future it will not be possible for Ministry to sanction any left-out LSBs on these 80 roads, as the scheme would end in March 2023.

4. Distribution of roads based on Traffic Category

Sl No	Traffic	3.75 m carriageway width						5.50 m carriageway width					
		No	Length in km	Pavement cost	Cost/km	Total Cost Rs. in Crores	Avg cost/km	No s	Length in km	Pavement cost	Cost/km	Cost Rs. In Crores	Avg cost/km
1	T4 & T5	44	231.38	110.36	47.70	130.97	56.60						
2	T6	27	95.80	35.70	37.27	45.63	47.63	5	21.73	8.17	37.60	11.54	53.11
3	T9							4	44.00	30.55	69.43	33.73	76.66
	Total	71	327.18	146.06	44.64	176.60	53.98	9	65.73	38.72	58.91	45.27	68.87

5. Pavement cost/ km wise details

Sl. No	Pavement cost/km	No of roads	
		3.75 m	5.5 m
1	<35 Lakhs	12	1
2	35-40	8	3
3	40-45	25	1
4	45-50	12	-
5	50-55	1	-
6	55-60	6	-
7	60-65	7	-
8	65-70	-	2
9	75-80	-	1
10	80-85	-	1
	Total	71	9

It was observed that 14 roads have Pavement cost/ km greater than Rs. 50 lakh/ km in 3.75 m carriageway width category roads. In 5.5 m carriageway width category roads, 4 roads have pavement cost/km greater than Rs. 65 lakh/ km. *NRIDA was asked to examine the DPRs of these roads, and whether the cost may be reduced by using new technology.*

6. Non Pavement cost/ km wise details

SI No	Pavement cost/km	No of roads	
		3.75 m	5.5 m
1	<15 Lakhs	57	7
2	15-20	7	1
3	20-25	4	-
4	25-30	1	1
5	30-35	2	-
	Total	71	9

The roads with pavement cost/ km greater than Rs. 20 lakh/ km are considered as outliers. In 3.75 m carriageway width category roads, 7 roads are outliers and in 5.5 m carriageway width category roads, 1 road is an outlier. NRIDA was asked to examine the same.

7. Distribution of roads based on widening to various carriageway

Categories of Upgradation	No.	Length (km)	Pav Cost (Lakhs)	Avg. Pav Cost (Lakhs)	Total Cost (Lakhs)	Avg. Total Cost (Lakhs)
3.75 - 3.75	4	34.85	1134.77	32.56	1391.39	39.93
3.0 - 3.75	67	292.33	13471.48	46.08	16268.02	55.65
3.0 - 5.5	9	65.73	3872.25	58.92	4527.35	68.88
Total	80	392.90	18478.50	47.03	22186.76	56.47

In 3.0-3.75 widening category, 67 no. of roads have been taken. Committee suggested that these roads could be taken in 3.0-5.5 category if PCU of these roads is higher. State PWD informed that PCU of these 67 roads is less than 2000. However, committee didn't find the widening from existing 3.0 m to 3.75 a very viable proposition. NRIDA mentioned that if the state goes for box cutting, then roller cannot enter such a small width. The State will have to open up shoulder of width to at least 1.1 or 1.2 m so that roller can enter into the box. State informed that they have provisioned 1.2 m width for box cutting in the DPR. State was asked to follow the same in the construction and SQMs should also be sensitized about it. A few of such DPRs should also be examined in NRIDA.

8. District wise proposal details

Sl No	District	3.75 m							5.5 m						
		No	Length in km	Pavement cost	Pavement cost/km	Total cost	Total cost/km	Non pavement cost/km	No	Length in km	Pavement cost	Pavement cost/km	Total cost	Total cost/km	Non pavement cost/km
1	Bastar	4	20.65	5.83	28.23	7.28	35.25	7.02	8	64.43	37.65	58.44	44.18	68.57	10.13
2	Kanker	29	103.20	40.84	39.57	50.38	48.82	9.25	1	1.30	1.07	82.31	1.09	83.85	1.54
3	Kondagaon	7	38.50	14.77	38.36	18.56	48.21	9.85	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Narayanpur	5	25.35	11.30	44.58	14.95	58.97	14.39	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	Rajnandgaon	8	26.00	11.61	44.65	13.81	53.12	8.47	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	Sukma	18	113.48	61.71	54.38	71.61	63.10	8.72	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	71	327.18	146.06	44.64	176.59	53.97	9.33	9	65.73	38.72	58.91	45.27	68.87	9.96

It was observed that district of Sukma has higher total cost/ km in 3.75 m carriageway width category roads and district of Kanker has higher total cost/ km in 5.5 m carriageway width category roads. State was asked to look into it and provide justification for the same.

9. DPR Issues

- i. State needs to certify that the proposed alignments are as per the road alignments approved by the MHA.
- ii. Proper photographs of transect walk, transect walk summary/ Minutes are not attached in most of the DPRs. State was asked to attach these in the DPRs.
- iii. 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. State has not proposed any widening of existing CDs in certain DPRs.
- iv. 3rd party traffic verification through ATCC as per recent advisory should be done by the State for 4 roads for which design traffic is more than 1 MSA. Reports should be attached with the DPRs.
- v. State should conduct the design stage RSA for the roads proposed with more than 5 km length and the reports should be attached with the DPRs. Sample reports need to be provided for verification.
- vi. State should propose Surface Dressing rather than PC&SC/ OGPC as per IRC:SP:72:2015. On T5 and less traffic, it should be 100% SD, and for T6 at least 50% surface should be taken up under SD.

- vii. The test results for GSB materials should be attached to the DPRs.
- viii. Width of WBM Gr II should be restricted to carriageway width of 3.75 m or 5.50 m. Offset is not allowed in base layers. State was asked to ensure the same.
- ix. X-section and L-section drawings were not attached to the DPRs. It should be attached with all the DPRs.
- x. Proper curve design was attached with the DPR. State was asked to attach the same.
- xi. State has proposed slab culverts invariably in the DPRs. State may propose pipe culverts wherever possible to suite site conditions.
- xii. Existing/proposed box culverts, slab culverts, Causeways portion needs to be deducted in pavement quantity to avoid duplication of quantities (CG0139).
- xiii. Hard shoulders shall be provided for a depth of 100 mm and in a width of 1m as per IRC SP:72. State has proposed for 150 mm thickness. This needs to be corrected. State mentioned that they have provisioned Morum for hard shoulders.
- xiv. IRC SP:20:2002 should be followed for CD works.
- xv. DPR contains only hydraulic data (poor readability), geotechnical investigation, estimate and drawings. There is no design in the DPRs. It should be supported with structural design by LSM.
- xvi. Joint Inspection report of Bridge site needs to be provided by the state.

10. **Maintenance**

It was observed that the 6th year renewal cost is Rs. 20.55 crore (9.26% with respect to construction cost) which is very less. State was asked to re-evaluate it. The percentage should be 18-23%.

11. **R&D Technology**

- i. State has not proposed any road under new technology. State was asked to propose adequate length (at least 15% of the total proposed length) under new technology as per new technology initiative guidelines. State may adopt cement stabilization in works which are in T4 & T5 category. Further state may explore the possibility of adopting FDR/ Stabilized base & Sub-base layers in some of the roads. This should invariably be adopted where pavement cost is high and/ or transportation of GSB/ aggregate is difficult or over a large distance.
- ii. State was asked to propose some roads for construction using Waste Plastic as waste plastic may be easily available.
- iii. State was advised to consult with SRRDA of Chhattisgarh regarding new technology and revise the DPRs.

12. **Progress of PMGSY works:**

It was observed that 9 works are still un-awarded in RCPLWEA. State informed that 9 works have been proposed for dropping. *State was asked to send the dropping proposal on priority.*

13. **e-Marg**

Chhattisgarh- RCPLWEA has not yet on-boarded eMARG even after multiple trainings conducted by NRIDA. Total 60 packages need to be pushed to eMarg. *State was asked to on-board the works on eMarg at the earliest, and certainly before the proposals can be considered by EC.*

14. **Quality**

i. QC labs have not been established in respect of 5 packages. State mentioned that they have established QC labs in all the packages. State & NRIDA were asked to re-check the same.

ii. Target for SQM Inspections during 2021-22 is 1401 against which 280 inspections have been carried out so far. State needs to allocate sufficient no. of works to the SQMs for inspections in order to achieve the target. State was further advised to employ SQMs from SRRDA also.

iii. 10.64% ongoing works have been graded as unsatisfactory by NQM. State needs to pay attention on the quality aspect.

iv. 13 ATRs of NQM observations are pending. State should take immediate action.

v. **Anomalies of SQM Inspections**

- Citizen information board is not as per MoRD specifications. Photos of PWD information board have been uploaded (CG0125, CG0101, CG012)
- Wrong engineering practice is being adopted for camber check. Spirit level is being laid horizontally and camber is calculated at the edge of spirit level which would not give reliable result (CG0108, CG0129, CG01014)
- No photo has been uploaded for Ongoing work inspection (CG0123, CG0105, CG0107)
- For thickness of Premix Carpet, cake is excavated and thickness of this cake is measured separately which is wrong procedure of checking thickness of BT layer (CG0129, CG0128, CG08004).
- Site Laboratory does not seem to be fully equipped as major equipments are missing in the photograph. SQM could have given Satisfactory Required Improvement for the same (CG0102,CG0125)

15. **Financial Issues:**

- i. State has not submitted Audited Balance Sheets for F.Y 2020-21. Interest recovery of Rs. 7.82 Cr. is pending from Bank.
- ii. 04 works are pending for financial closure for more than 180 days as on 08-11-2021.
- iii. State share budget is not reflected in PFMS TSRY-07 report.

State was asked to expedite the submission/ completion of above mentioned financial issues.

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 possible.

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