

No. P-17024/1/2021-RC (FMS No 374264)

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

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the December, 2021

Minutes

Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee held on 20th December, 2021, to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Jharkhand for Road Connectivity Project under Left Wing Extremism Area (RCPLWEA) (Batch-II, 2021-22)-reg.

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on 20th December, 2021 at 04:00 P.M through Video Conferencing, to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Jharkhand for Road Connectivity Project under Left Wing Extremism Area (RCPLWEA) (Batch-II, 2021-22) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action.

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

(Anjali Yadav)

Assistant Director (RC)

Tel. No: 011-23070308

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. Chief Engineer, JSRRDA
- iii. Director (LWE), Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, New Delhi
- iv. All Directors in NRIDA.

Copy to:-

Sr. PPS to Secretary (RD)/ PPS to AS& FA/PPS to AS (RD)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 20th DECEMBER, 2021 AT 4.00 PM TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF JHARKHAND UNDER RCPLWEA (BATCH II), 2021-22

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (EC) was held through Video Conference on **20th December, 2021 at 4.00 PM** under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary (RD) to consider the proposal of the State of Jharkhand under RCPLWEA (Batch-II) of 2021-22. Following officials were present in the meeting.

Government of India Representatives	
Dr. Ashish Kumar Goel	Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA
Shri K.M Singh	Deputy Secretary (RC), MoRD
Ms. Anjali Yadav	Assistant Director (RC), MoRD
Shri. B C Pradhan	Consultant Director (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Shri I.K.Pateriya	Director (P.III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agrawal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
Shri Rajendra Goel	Director (P-II), NRIDA
State Government. Representatives	
Dr. Manish Ranjan	Secretary-cum-CEO, RWD, Jharkhand
Shri Ramkumar Sinha	Additional Secretary
Shri J.P Singh	Chief Engineer, JSSRDA
Shri Sanjay Kumar	SQC, JSRRDA
Shri S. Verma	NMO, JSRRDA
Shri Dinesh Pradhan	Finance Controller, JSRRDA
Shri Manish Kesari	IT Nodal Officer, JSRRDA

2. Current Proposal by the State:

A detailed presentation on the proposal of RCPLWEA, (Batch-II) of 2021-22 submitted by the State of Jharkhand was made before the Pre-Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:-

Item	As per OMMAS dated 18.12.2021			
	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km (Lakhs)
Roads	58	361.47	262.43	72.60
LSBs	26	973.94	53.53	5.49
Total	58 roads + 26 LSBs	361.47 km roads + 973.94 m LSBs	315.96	
*MoRD Share : Rs 188.15 Crore			State share : Rs 127.81Crore	

3.75 m width road - 57 Nos & Length – 352.41 km - Rs. 70.48 Lakhs/km

5.50 m width road - 1 Nos & Length - 9.06 km - Rs. 155.02 Lakhs/km

3. General Observations

- i) The State of Jharkhand has already been sanctioned 1,976.68 km under RCPLWEA.
- ii) The current batch of proposals is for 58 number of roads of 361.47 km and 26 LSBs. Out of 58 roads, 57 roads of 352.41 km are proposed with 3.75 m width at a cost of Rs. 70.48 lakh/km and 1 road of 9.06 km is proposed with 5.50 m width at an average cost of Rs. 155.02 lakh/km.
- iii) All road works have been scrutinized by the STAs and uploaded on OMMAS. 22 Bridges are scrutinized by STAs. Balance 4 bridges are yet to be scrutinized by STAs. PTA scrutiny of only 4 road works has been done. None of the bridge proposals have been scrutinized by PTA. State was asked to get done the PTA scrutiny of roads and bridges as per norms. ***The same should be complied before the EC meeting.***
- iv) State was asked if the 26 bridges are proposed on the 58 roads. State informed that all the proposed bridges fall in the alignment of the proposed roads. NRIDA was asked to get it confirmed.
- v) NRIDA mentioned that, MHA has approved 71 no. of roads for the state, and the state has proposed 58 no. of roads. State was asked if they are coming for the balance works or this is the final figure. State informed that MHA is yet to approve 13 roads of 76 km, hence they have proposed $71-13=58$ roads. MHA will intimate the final approval in 2-3 days to the state. Thereafter, these 13 roads will be proposed. State was asked about the estimates of these roads, state mentioned that they will prepare the estimates in 10 days after the approval of MHA. Committee mentioned that timeline for completion of RCPLWEA works is March 2023, hence, ***the state itself needs to follow up with MHA and get the approval of these 13 roads so that the EC meeting of the 71 roads can be done altogether. State assured that they will get it approved within a week.***

4. Distribution of roads based on traffic category

It was observed that, the average total cost/ km of the road of 3.75 m width proposed in T2 traffic category is Rs. 74.76 lakh/ km which is very high. Further, the pavement cost of roads of 3.75 m width proposed in T3 traffic category is Rs. 51.79 lakh/ km. The average total cost/ km of the roads of 3.75 m width in T5 traffic category is Rs. 80.31 lakh/ km. The average total cost/ km of the roads of 3.75 m width in T7 traffic category is Rs. 65.15 lakh/ km and pavement cost of roads in 5.50 m width in T9 traffic category is Rs. 141.20 lakh/ km. ***State was asked to examine such roads with abnormally high costs. It was advised that box culverts should be used instead of bridges for CD. Non-pavement cost is quite high in most of the proposals.***

5. Distribution of roads based on widening to various carriageway/ PCU Details

- i) It was observed that, the state has proposed 46 roads of 3 m carriageway width for widening to 3.75 m. Further, PCU of 42 roads were found to be less than 1000. State was asked as to how these roads have been proposed for widening from 3 m to 3.75 m. Further, NRIDA mentioned that for equal widening on both sides, width of only 0.375 m will be there on both the sides and it will not be possible to excavate the trench and to do the rolling. **Both traffic**

category and PCU were observed to be very less and widening from 3 m to 3.75 m doesn't seem required. State was advised to retain these roads to 3 m. State agreed to the same.

6. District wise details of current proposals

i) Following districts were identified as outliers in terms of total average cost/ km for roads with 3.75 m width: -

- Total average cost/ km of roads in Chatra district was found to be Rs. 74.99 lakh/ km.
- Total average cost/ km of road in Garhwa district was found to be Rs. 100.50 lakh/ km. State mentioned that the said road lies in extremely LWE affected area which is a hilly terrain.
- Total average cost/ km of roads in Gumla district was found to be Rs. 85.74 lakh/ km.

State was asked to rationalize the cost in the above flagged districts. State mentioned that the roads include minor bridges also which has led to increase in cost. State was asked to construct box culverts in place of bridges, which gets constructed easily and have more strength. Further, it will reduce the cost also. **In general, the state should adopt soil/ cement stabilization and other stabilization methodologies to reduce pavement cost.**

ii) It was observed that one road of 5.50 m width in Paschimi Singhbhum district has pavement cost of Rs. 141.20 lakh/ km which is very high. State informed that they have rationalized the cost of CD works and now the cost has been reduced to Rs. 95 lakh/ km by adopting new technology.

7. Average Cost Trends

i) It was observed that average cost of roads of 5.5 m width is Rs. 155.02 lakh/ km which was Rs. 92.09 lakh/ km in the previous batch of sanction. Cost has been observed to increase substantially. State was asked to examine the same.

ii) It was observed that the average cost of bridges have increased to Rs. 5.49 lakh/ km from Rs. 3.94 lakh/ km in the previous batch of sanction. Reason for the same was asked from the state. State informed that it was examined and the cost has been reduced to Rs. 4.25 lakh/ km. NRIDA was asked to examine the same.

8. DPR Issues

i) State had proposed conventional CC 100 mm thickness in the habitation area over the existing CC pavement in some of DPRs. State was asked as to why they have proposed an overlay of 100 mm thickness. State mentioned that the roads are very old hence 100 mm is the least thickness required. **State was asked to adopt new technologies like paneled cement concrete (100 mm), RCCP etc.** State assured to adopt the same.

ii) NRIDA mentioned that the new CD works should be proposed based on the actual site requirement and as per the structural condition of the existing structure. State was asked to explore the possibility of maintaining existing good CDs with minor repairs/rehabilitation or proper cleaning or construction of parapet walls instead of reconstruction, wherever possible. State mentioned that new CD works have been proposed as per actual site requirements. Existing CDs in good condition have been retained with provision of necessary repair. **The same should be verified on the basis of photographs and videos.**

iii) State was asked to get the Road Safety Audit report conducted by the qualified road safety auditor with due justifications and attach the report to the DPRs of proposed length greater than 5 km. State was further asked to make road safety provision as per audit report and mark all proposed road safety items in the strip plan. State informed that the road safety audit is in progress and the report will be submitted shortly.

iv) For the traffic category T2, state has proposed the Bituminous macadam of thickness 50mm. This provision is not there in IRC: SP:72- 2015. State was asked to design the road as per IRC: SP:72- 2015. State informed that provision of BM has been deleted. State was asked about the provisions made in other traffic category roads. State informed that 40 mm BC has been provisioned in the BT layer. ***NRIDA was asked to check all the DPRs for BT provision.***

9. Maintenance

i) State has proposed 6th year Renewal cost of Rs. 43.9257 crore which is 16.74 % of construction cost. The same should ideally be more than 18% of the construction cost.

10. R&D Proposals

i) State has not proposed any road for construction using Mainstream technology.

ii) State has proposed cement stabilization for 85 km. The same has not been uploaded by the state yet. State was asked to upload it on OMMAS on priority. There is need to take up more roads under stabilization and RCCP/ Paneled CC and other new technologies so as to reduce overall costs. New technologies should also be used in protection works.

iii) State informed that they have proposed waste plastics for construction of roads of 5.5 m width. Further, roads of Chatra and Khunti districts are also proposed for construction using waste plastics. State was asked to upload the same on OMMAS.

11. Physical Progress

i) It was observed that, 125 roads of 774.42 km have not yet been awarded. State informed that they will award all the work shortly except 2 roads because they will go for re-tender of these roads. State was asked to award these works and update on OMMAS.

ii) Award status of PMGSY-III works was asked from the state. State informed that they are likely to award these works by 25th December 2021. State was asked to carefully upload the awarded amount on OMMAS in consultation with NRIDA, so that award analysis can be smoothly done.

iii) Annual physical target allotted to the state is 563 km under RCPLWEA, against which state has so far constructed 89 km, which is very less. The state needs to expedite construction.

12. eMarg

i) It was observed that 22% of the packages are pending for MEE. RI has been missed in 73% of the roads, payment in 67% of the roads is pending for more than 6 months. 86% packages are pending for the first payment. State needs to work on the progress on eMarg sincerely ***and show substantial progress before the EC.***

13. Quality

- i) Out of 106 ongoing packages, lab has not been established for 7 packages.
- ii) State has 72 active SQMs against the total requirement of 78. State should empanel more number of SQMs or go for hiring of SQMs so that more number of works can be inspected.
- iii) Only 115 inspections have been conducted by the State out of the target of 1,117 inspections targeted for 2021-22 (RCPLWEA), which is substantially low. State is required to increase the inspections frequency in order to meet the annual inspection target.
- iv) 2 ATRs of NQM observations are pending with the State.
- v) Various anomalies in respect of SQM inspection have been seen which area as follows:
 - a. No Photograph uploaded for packages JH17RCPL-PAL-04 , JH24RCPL-KHU-03 , JH01RCPL-BOK-01 even after more than three months of inspection.
 - b. Observations are not made based on requisite no. of test pits (JH01RCPL-BOK-02, JH02RCPL-CHA-02, JH10RCPL-GUM-05, JH11WLWE01).
 - c. Critical observations are left out in detailed report (JH01RCPL-BOK-01, JH05RCPL-DUM-01, JH24RCPL-KHU-17).

SQM needs to be sensitized to reduce such anomalies.

14. Financial Issues:

- i) State has not submitted the Balance Sheet for F.Y 2021-22. State needs to submit the same on priority.
- ii) State has not submitted bank interest verification reports from 2010-11 to 2020-21. State should submit the same at the earliest.
- iii) 153 works pending for financial closure for more than 180 days as on 16-12-2021. State needs to look into it and ensure the financial closure of these works on priority.
- iii) State has submitted incorrect and incomplete financial reconciliation report. Complete financial reconciliation report should be submitted.
- iv) State budget reflected in PFMS TSRY-07 report is not in 60:40 ratio. State should look into it and resolve the issue.

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.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to and from the Chair.
