## File No-P.17024/28/2022-RC (FMS-381714)

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

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi Dated the 1st November, 2022

#### **MINUTES**

Subject: Minutes of the Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals of State of Uttarakhand under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) - reg.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on <u>17<sup>th</sup> October</u>, <u>2022 at 3:00 PM</u> under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA (through VC) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State of Uttarakhand under Batch-I of PMGSY-III for the year 2022-23.

2. State is requested to furnish the Compliance Report on the observations made during the meeting on time for conducting the EC Meeting.

Encl. as above.

(Devinder Kumar)
Director (RC)
Tel. No.011-23070129

#### Distribution:

- 1. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Uttarakhand, Secretariat 4, Subhash Road, Uttarakhand-248001.
- 2. The Chief Executive Officer, Uttarakhand Rural Roads Development Agency, 1st Floor, Directorate of Panchayati Raj, Opp. IT Park, Sahastradhara Road, Dehradun-248013.
- 3. Engineer, Rural Development Department, Government of Uttarakhand, Dehradun
- 4. All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5th Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066.

#### Copy for information to:-

PSO to Secretary (RD)/PPS to AS&FA/PPS to AS (RD)

# MINUTES OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 17thOCTOBER, 2022 AT 03:00 PM TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY STATE GOVERNMENT OF UTTARAKHAND UNDER PMGSY-III, (BATCH-I, 2022-23)

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (RC) was held through Video Conference on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2022 at 03:00 PM under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Uttarakhand under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) (Batch-I) of 2022-23. The following officials were present in the meeting:-

Dr Ashish Kumar Goel	Additional Secretary (RD), MoRD & DG, NRIDA
Shri Devinder Kumar	Director (RC), MoRD
Shri B C Pradhan	Consultant/Director (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Aggarwal	Director (Projects-I), NRIDA
Dr. I.K.Pateriya	Director (Projects-III), NRIDA
Shri Kailash Bisht	Deputy Director (F&A), NRIDA
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri Uday Raj Singh	CEO, URRDA
Shri R.P. Singh	CE, URRDA
Shri B.P. Kandpal	FC, URRDA
Shri S.K. Pathak	SQC, URRDA
Shri Rajesh Kumar	NMO, URRDA
Shri Sanjay Singh	EE, URRDA
Shri Arvind Singh Jyala	ITNO, URRDA

# 2. Details of Proposal

The current proposals of the State Govt under PMGSY-III, Batch-I of 2022-23 are as under:-

As per OMMAS as on 14.10.2022						
Item	Nos	Length (in km/ m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)		
Roads	76	806.592	611.76	75.84		
LSBs	-	_	-	-		
Total	76 roads	806.592 km roads	611.76*	75.84		
*MoRD Share: Rs. 55	50.59 Cr.	State Share: Rs. 61.17 Cr.				
Target: 2287.50 Km Sanc		nctioned: Nil	Balance: 2287.50 Km			

#### 3. General Observations

All proposals have been scrutinized on OMMAS by STAs. The scrutiny of proposals is yet to be carried out by PTA. State should conduct 10% PTA scrutiny of the proposals on OMMAS on priority and certainly before the EC meeting.

## 4. Trace Map ranking

Min. Trace MapRank	Numbers of Proposals	%
1 to 15	44	58%
16 to 50	22	29%
51 to 100	7	9%
> 100	3	4%
Total	76	

<sup>\*</sup>All proposals below Trace Map rank 50 needs to be justified by the State.

#### 5. Planning Audit (Proposals)

- i. All 76 road proposals are uploaded on GEOSADAK.
- ii. Total 50 Sample proposals were audited by NRIDA for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III & out of which justification for 08 proposals were asked for and 04 proposals were flagged for modification.
- iii. State has submitted the compliance for all 12 proposals.
- iv. In 01 proposal, minor modification has been done.
- v. Justification for "T07-Kushail Band to ToliJigoli Motor Road" has been found unsatisfactory. It has been observed that this road (Non BT/CC length 5.7 km) is not benefiting any large population. Pre-EC has advised to re-check the above road and justify as how it is meeting PMGSY -III objectives. Prima facie it needs to be deleted.

#### 6. Surface wise details of existing roads

Out of total proposed length of 806.59 km, 30.27 km is gravel, 7.905 km is moorum, 760.55 km is BT and 7.865 km is CC. State should justify the inclusion of roads where BT/CC portion is < 25%. In two roads non-BT/CC portion was more than 25%. It was informed that one road would be deleted (as above) and in another the non-BT is 26%, which may be accepted.

# 7. High Priority roads skipped in CUCPL

It was observed that several high-priority roads have been skipped citing different reasons. Pre-Empowered Committee advised that 123 roads have been skipped since TR/MRL being terminating link, 13 roads due to length less than limit decided, 05 roads due to ownership is with other departments and many other citing different reasons. Pre-EC has observed that the timeline for PMGSY-III is till March, 2025. Thus, these roads (especially the 13 roads of marginally lesser length and 5 with ownership with different dept) should be examined critically and State should identify useful/important roads amongst these or submit proper justification for exclusion of each of these roads from the current batch of proposal.

# 8. Details of roads with PCU/day

In 3.75 m carriageway width, 40 roads have PCU less than 500, 34 roads have PCU between 500 and 1000 and 02 roads have PCU between 1000 and 1500. *Pre-EC advised the State to check PCU and traffic category of the roads which have been skipped* and if they have higher traffic than those proposed.

# 9. Distribution of roads based on widening to various carriageway widths

Pre-Empowered Committee observed that the State has proposed widening of 08 roads from 3 to 3.75 m.

State should clearly indicate the kind of procedure to be followed while widening of roads so as to have proper compaction and also explain the methodology of compaction for widened portion. State was also requested to intimate that in how many roads hill cutting is involved.

# 10. Length-wise proposal details

All 76 roads are more than 5 Km in length. Average Candidate road length is 12.03 km and average proposed road length is 10.61 km. As the state is a hill state, they should examine roads which are marginally lesser than 5 km but are of high utility or higher traffic, as mentioned in para 7 above.

# 11. Average Cost trends (Roads)

The average cost has been increased from Rs. 62.53 lakh/km at the time of PMGSY-II (2019-20) to 75.85 lakh/km now. The Committee observed that the average cost is abnormally high in Chamoli, Nainital, Tehri and Uttarkashi districts of Uttarakhand. State was advised to re-examine the cost and intimate whether new SOR has been made effective on above cost or not. They should also examine cost implication (increase) due to GST and new SOR separately.

## 12. Details of roads with pavement cost per km

In 3.75 m carriageway width, 16 roads have pavement cost more than 40 lakh/km.

State is requested to examine the DPRs of these high pavement cost in general and to furnish proper justification along with breakdown details for the same road-wise. NRIDA should also examine the cost of pavement (layer-wise) and find out where it is more and bring out the outliers. New technology solutions, such as cement stabilization, nano technology etc, should be adopted to bring down the cost.

#### 13. Details of roads with non-pavement cost per km

41 roads have very high non-pavement cost (more than 40 lakh/km). Detailed justification is required for such abnormal high non-pavement cost. Pre-EC observed that this high non-pavement cost may be due to inclusion of non-BT/CC (Kucha) roads. State should examine the DPRs in consultation with NRIDA, do field inspections, and suggest ways to bring down the cost.

# NRIDA shall also depute a few teams to the state to examine the DPRs and undertake field inspections.

#### 14. DPR Issues

- i. Proposed and existing slab culverts portion needs to be deducted inpavement quantity to avoid duplication of quantities.
- ii. State has proposed ICBP pavement. However, state should propose the CC pavement in built-up area and other vulnerable portions of the road. The cement concrete shall be replaced with panelled concrete or cell-filled concrete. The thickness of the same to be reduced as per IRC SP:62 on the basis of CPVD.
- iii. For overlay thickness, the Para 2.2.3 of IRC SP:72:2015 should be used for all upgradation roads. If the existing surface is extensively damaged, the design chart given in Fig 4 of IRC SP:72:2015 shall be used. State has provided OGPC+ Seal coat instead of surface dressing for traffic of T4 category, which is not as per NTV 2022. MSD should be undertaken as it is superior to OGPC. If State does not want to do MSD, then they can adopt superior BC, and bear the extra cost.
- iv. State has not specified proper locations of the proposed protection works (retaining walls, breast walls, Gabion walls, Plum walls). Pitching/turfing is also proposed in higher quantities which needs to be re-evaluated and corrected as per actual site requirement.
- v. Excess length of metallic crash barriers is provided in some DPRs. The same shall be rationalized as per site conditions and shall only be provided at steep curves of hill area.

- vi. State should attach Road Safety Audit report conducted by the qualified road safety auditor with due justifications and road safety provision should be made as per audit report. All proposed road safety items should be marked in the strip plan.
- vii. Chainages have not been mentioned for retaining walls and breast balls in Performa C of few DPRs. Hence the requirements of the same cannot be verified through cross section details. Same shall be mentioned in the DPRs.
- viii. State should certify that informations uploaded on Proforma-C is in congruence with the corresponding data of DPRs.

#### 15. R&D Proposals

- State has not proposed use of Green/ New technologies as per NTV 2022. Entire proposal of 806.59 km falls under T4 (610.23 km) &T5 (196.36 km) traffic categories. As per the vision document 2022, State must propose 100% length below T5 category roads using Mechanized Surface Dressing.
- Pre EC directed that the latest technical presentation of MSD made by one of the firm should be made available to state with the caveat that many such firms/ solutions are available in the market and a fair competition exists.
- State has not proposed Cold Mix Technology. State must propose 25% of the total eligible proposed length using Cold Mix Technology as per New Technology Vision 2022.
- State has not proposed waste plastic in 70% of the eligible length involving Hot Mix.
- State should propose 100% proposed CC length under Panelled Cement Concrete/ Cell Filled Concrete.

# The State was further asked to ensure the following: -

- i. State must ensure that MoU with Technology Provider is signed as per NTV-2022.
- ii. State needs to provide performance evaluation reports of earlier sanctioned works and the roads have been completed. No interim reports have been received so far.

#### 16. Progress of PMGSY Works

Annual physical target of the State is 1487 Km, out of which, only 543 Km has been completed. State still needs to complete balance target. The details of work sanctioned, completed, and pending under PMGSY-I and II are given below.

#### Roads

	Sanctioned		Completed		Balance		Un-awarded	
Scheme	Noc	Length	Nos.	Length	No. of	Length	No. of	Length
	INOS.	(Km)		(Km)	Roads	(km)	Road	(km)
PMGSY I	2,300	19,376.95	2,008	18,248.39	292	941.04	3	12.62
PMGSY II	112	905.83	97	887.32	15	14.42	0	0.00
Total:	2,412	20,282.78	2,105	19,135.71	307	955.4	3	12.62

#### LSBs

Scheme	Sanction (Nos.)	Completed (Nos.)	Balance (Nos.)	Unaward (Nos.)
PMGSY I	362	171	191	1
PMGSY II	7	0	7	0
Total:	369	171	198	1

Out of the total works sanctioned under PMGSY-I, & II, 3 roads and 01 LSB remain unawarded. According to state these unawarded works have been proposed for dropping. During the meeting, it has been reiterated that State need to put more efforts, so that the pending works of PMGSY-I & II are completed at the earliest.

#### 17. Maintenance of roads under DLP

During 2021-22, against the liability of Rs. 71.53 crore, expenditure of Rs. 32.22 crore has been done. For the current financial year 2022-23, the maintenance liability is Rs. 99.98 crore and as on 17.10.2022, the expenditure is Rs. 11.57 crore only. State has not updated/credited any amount in SRRDA's account in 2022-23 (Only demand amounting to Rs. 55.70 crore has been raised to the State). Therefore, State was asked to intimate/update the fund released to SRRDA under DLP during the above-mentioned period.

No renewal has been done during the last year. The State has not updated renewal length and expenditure data on OMMAS. The same is required to be done immediately.

During the meeting, the State has intimated that all 246 roads under Post DLP are being transferred to PWD Department for their maintenance. PWD Department has also been instructed to raise demand for one time maintenance on above roads.

#### 18. e-Marg

Out of total 765 packages pushed to e-MARG, 87 (11%) packages are pending for locking, 119 (16%) packages are pending for manual entry expenditure (MEE). 242 roads are eligible for routine inspection in September, 2022, 36 roads (15%) are pending for routine inspection (RI) missed. 162 packages are pending for payment for payment for >3 months. 51 (31%) packages are pending for payment for first payment for > 3 months. Expenditure of Rs.10.71 core has been done using e-MARG in FY 2022-23. Total expenditure of Rs. 6.26 crore (58%) has been done on bills having liability of FY 2022-23. The above position is not satisfactory. The State should take necessary steps to increase DLP expenditure on roads due for maintenance in 2022-23. There should be visible progress on e-Marg before EC meeting.

# 19. Quality

- (a) Out of 467 ongoing packages, QC labs have not been established in 35 packages. This should be saturated. There are 126 works which have not been inspected even once. These should be inspected immediately and certainly before EC meeting.
- (b) Number of active SQMs are 64 against requirement of 27 SQMs. During 2022-23, 1628 SQM inspections are targeted and till date, 955 inspections have been conducted. State was asked to expedite pace of inspection to achieve the target.
- (c) 45 ATRs are pending at State Level. Out of which, 15 ATRs are pending for more than 2 years. State should show substantial compliance for these pending ATRs before they come for EC meeting.
- (d) Unsatisfactory grading by NQM from October, 2019 to September, 2022 for completed works is 9.45%, for ongoing works it is 13.92% and for maintenance works it is 45.59%. The unsatisfactory grading by SQM during the same period for completed works is 0.41%, for ongoing works it is 3.69% and for maintenance works it is 16.94%. Thus, the quality grading awarded by the SQM is abnormally low when compared to grading awarded by the NQM. This is not a satisfactory saturation.

Unsatisfactory grading by NQM from October, 2021 to September, 2022 for completed works is 12.90%, ongoing works, it is 14.86% and for maintenance works, it is 41.18% as compared to quality grading of 0.31%, 4.68% and 21.37% for completed, ongoing and maintenance works respectively by the SQM. Performance evaluation of SQMs should be done before the EC meeting.

(e) 10 complaints are pending at State level during the financial year 2021-22 & 2022-23 which is required to be resolved at the earliest.

The State was asked to review the performance of active SQMs on priority and take action against the defaulting SQMs. State was advised to take immediate corrective action and show some improvement in the aforesaid issues and furnish the ATR before EC meeting.

# 20. SQM Analysis

- i. It was also observed that SQMs empanelled by the State have graded very few works 'Unsatisfactory' out of the large number of projects inspected by them. The State was advised to scrutinize and find out whether the performance of such SQMs are satisfactory.
- ii. Inspections done by SQMs need to be compared with the inspections done by NQMs road-wise.
- iii. It has also been observed that more inspections have been done by the SQM who has graded most of roads as satisfactory and less inspections have been done by the SQMs who has graded some roads as unsatisfactory. This aspect also needs to be checked at State level, and proper ATR be put up at the time of EC.

#### 21. Financial issues

- a. State has not submitted audited balance sheets of all the three funds for FY 2021-22.
- b. State has not submitted audited balance sheets of Maintenance fund for FY 2020-21.
- c. Interest of Rs. 2.39 Cr. is also pending for recovery from Bank.
- d. Interest verification certificate has also not been submitted for FY 2004-05 to 2009-10.
- e. State has not submitted PMGSY financial reconciliation report.
- f. Financial closure of 129 works is pending for more than 180 days as on 15.10.2022. The State may take immediate action and expedite pending financial closure of completed works.

The State was asked to look into these financial issues and take appropriate action.

**22.** 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.

\*\*\*\*\*\*