

File No.P-17024/29(1)/2019-RC (FMS-370559)

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

Room No.464
Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 6th July, 2021


MINUTES

Subject: Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the State Government of West Bengal for the 2021-22 (Batch-I) -reg.

The undersigned is directed to forward herewith the Minutes of the meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on **1st July, 2021 at 12:00 Noon** under the chairmanship of Joint Secretary (RC) and DG (NRIDA) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State of West Bengal for the year 2021-22 under (PMGSY-III, Batch-I).

2. State is requested to furnish the compliance report to the Ministry/NRIDA at the earliest so that EC meeting could be conducted on time.

Encl. as above


(Devinder Kumar)
Director (RC)
Tel: 011-23070129

Distribution:

1. **Shri M.V Rao**, Additional Chief Secretary (P&RD Department) & CEO (WBSRDA), HC-7, Joint Administrative Building, Sector-III, Salt Lake, Kolkatta-700106 **Email: acs.wbprd@gmail.com**
2. **Shri Dipanjan Bhattacharya**, Joint Secretary (P&RD Department) & Joint Chief Executive Officer (WBSRDA), Government of West Bengal, Joint Administrative Building, Block HC-7, Sector-III, Salt Lake, Kolkatta-700106 **Email: dipanjan2207@gmail.com**

Copy for information to:-

PPS to Secretary (RD)/PPS to AS&FA/PPS to AS(RD)/PPS to JS(RC)/All Directors, NRIDA, New Delhi

Minutes of the Pre-Empowered Committee Meeting held on 01.07.2021 for consideration of proposal of the State of West Bengal under PMGSY-III, Batch-I of 2021-22

A meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee was held on 01.07.2021 at 12.00 PM under the Chairpersonship of JS (RC) & DG (NRIDA) to consider the project proposal submitted by the State of West Bengal for PMGSY-III, Batch I of 2021-22. The following officials were present in the meeting: -

Dr. Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary (RC)& DG, NRIDA
Sh. Devinder Kumar	Director (RC), MoRD
Sh. B.C. Pradhan	Consultant/ Director (Technical), NRIDA
Dr. I.K. Pateriya	Director (P-II), NRIDA
Sh. Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Sh. P. Mohanasundaram	Joint Director (NRIDA)
State Govt. Representatives	
Sh. Dipanjan Bhattacharya,	Joint Secretary (P&RD Department) & Joint Chief Executive Officer (WBSRDA)
Sh. Amal Kanti Mandal,	Chief Engineer, WBSRDA
Sh. Vishwanath Acharya	State Quality Coordinator
Sh. S. Khan	Nodal Maintenance Officer
Sh. Arnab Biswas	Executive Engineer
Sh. A. Gupta	Assistant Engineer
Sh. Rajdeep Maity	GIS Nodal Officer
Sh. Gautam Roy	IT Nodal Officer

2. Current proposals of the State Govt. under PMGSY-III, Batch-I of 2020-21 are as under:

As per State's proposal dated 29.06.2021					As per OMMAS as on 29.06.2021			
Item	Nos	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)	Nos	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)
Up-Gradation - Roads	454	2,826.62	2,207.28	78.09	454	2,826.62	2,207.28	78.09
Total	454	2,826.62	2,207.28	78.09	454	2,826.62	2,207.28	78.09

*MoRD Share: Rs. 1320.60 Crores
Target: 6287.50 km

State Share: Rs. 886.69 Crores;
Sanctioned till date: 0

STA has scrutinized all proposals, however PTA scrutiny of at least 10% of the proposals is yet to be done. The state was advised to complete the PTA scrutiny before EC. State seems to have wrongly uploaded RQI length of 1,385 km. State should rectify the same on OMMAS.

State has not proposed any LSBs in this Batch. According to state, they will submit proposals of 52 to 59 LSBs by the end of September, 2021. State has been asked to finalize the list of LSBs and forward the same to Ministry along with joint inspection reports of sites at the earliest before EC.

3. **Carriageway width wise and Average cost wise details of road:** 442 roads of 2704.08 km length are 3.75 m wide with an average cost of Rs 76.74 lakhs/km, 12 roads of 122.56 km length are 5.50 m width with an average cost of Rs. 107.77 lakhs/km. There is a huge cost variation in 3.75 m wide roads in various districts. Especially, non-pavement cost is abnormally on higher side in many districts. For example, for 3.75 m wide road, in **Alipurduar** District, pavement cost is Rs.48.15 lakhs/km and non-pavement cost is Rs.33.95 lakhs/km. In **Cooch-Bihar** district, pavement cost is Rs.54.78 lakhs/km and non-pavement cost is Rs.27.77 lakhs/km. In **Darjeeling** district, pavement cost is Rs.54.63 lakhs/km and non-pavement cost is Rs.88.68 lakhs/km. In **Howrah** district, pavement cost is Rs.55.04 lakh/km and non-pavement cost is Rs.28.07 lakh/km. In **Jalpaiguri** district, pavement cost is Rs.39.97 lakh/km and non-pavement cost is Rs.28.63 lakh/km. In **Murshidabad** district, pavement cost is Rs.45.30 lakh/km and non-pavement cost is Rs.28.40 lakh/km. In **Nadia** district, pavement cost is Rs.57.04 lakh/km and non-pavement cost is Rs.27.07 lakh/km. In **Siliguri M.P** district, pavement cost is Rs.37.10 lakh/km and non-pavement cost is Rs.27.97 lakh/km. In **South 24 Parganas** district, pavement cost is Rs.63.42 lakh/km and non-pavement cost is Rs.26.65 lakh/km. **Therefore, state is requested to examine the DPRs for abnormally high non-pavement cost in general, and also high cost of pavement in some districts.**

4. **Traffic wise details of road:** In 3.75 m carriageway width, 250 roads of 1481.28 km are in T4&T5 category with average cost Rs 77.62 lakhs/km, 82 roads of 504.65 km are in T6 category with average cost Rs 72.38 lakhs/km, 108 roads of 707.59 km are in T7 category with average cost Rs 77.85 lakhs/km and 2 roads of 10.54 km are in T9 category with average cost Rs 88.14 lakhs/km. In 5.50 m carriageway width, 02 roads of 13.52 km are in T6 category with average cost of Rs. 73.22 lakhs/km, 2 roads of length 18.49 km with average cost Rs. 101.35 lakhs/km are in T7 category, 2 roads of length 18.49 km with average cost Rs 131.91 lakhs/km are in T8 category, 4 roads of length 40.22 km with average cost Rs 106.71 lakhs/km are in T9 category and 2 roads of length 31.75 km with average cost Rs 113.54 lakhs/km are in > 2 MSA traffic category. Following issues came up during discussion: -

(i) State has intimated that in 20 roads PCU counts is more than 3000 and in 250 roads, it is in the range of 2000-3000 and same are uploaded on OMMAS. Therefore, according to state, in these 270 roads PCU/day is more than 2000. But on the other hand, state has given details of roads based on traffic category in which 250 roads are in T4 &T5 category. State was not in a position to fully explain the reasons for this anomaly. CEO, WBSRRDA, has requested for 3 to 4 weeks time to have comprehensive review of all these roads.

(ii) Committee has also intimated the State that for smooth flow of traffic, it is advisable to design the width of the road for entire design period keeping in view the expected growth of traffic in future.

NRIDA has been directed to send the two planning teams to the state of West Bengal for verification of DPRs and addressing other planning issues also.

5. **Length wise proposal details:** Out of 454 roads, 150 roads are 3 to 5 km in length with average cost Rs.80.74 lakhs/km and 304 roads are 5 km and above with average cost Rs.77.39 lakh/km. Average candidate road length is 8.46 km and average proposed road length is 6.23 km.

6. **Surface wise details of roads:** Out of the total proposed length of 2826.62 km length, 170.59 is brick soling, 260.05 km is track, 737.04 km is gravel, 92.25 km is WBM, 1229.49 km is BT and 337.20 km is CC. Following issues were discussed on which state has to take action: -

(i) State should justify high proportion of track/gravel/WBM/brick soling roads and as to how they are classified as MLR/TR. Road wise information should be presented in a tabular form in which BT and non-BT portion length and percentage should be mentioned, and detailed justification be given for taking up non-BT portion and what is the projected PCU. *Team detailed from NRIDA will also examine these issues on satellite map/GIS which should be done along with traffic survey data.*

(ii) Committee has also pointed out that whether these track/gravel roads are part of core network and how these roads are eligible to be considered in PMGSY-III.

7. DPR issues

Following DPR issues were presented for consideration before Pre EC. Observations of the Committee on these issues are as under:

- i. State should provide a copy of SLSC approval, MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats and consent letters of Hon'ble MPs on final proposal as per latest advisory issued by MoRD on 02 Jun 2020. This action should be accomplished at the time of EC so as to save time in sanction of these proposals.
- ii. Proper transect walk photographs, transect walk summary/Minutes, and copy of Gram Sabha's approval need to be attached to the DPRs.
- iii. State should certify that the roads proposed in current batch are not PMGSY roads which are under design life and also to ensure that 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. State should also ensure that the existing CDs are widened to 9 m width for 5.50 m wide roads.
- iv. Independent 3rd party traffic survey and Axle load test survey reports need to be provided where the roads designed with projected traffic more than 1 MSA as per recent advisory dated 24.12.2020. Reports need to be provided to NRIDA for verification.

- v. State should ensure that the design stage RSA has been done for all the proposed candidate roads and the reports should be attached with the DPRs and uploaded on OMMAS.
- vi. State should propose surface dressing where the roads are designed with T5 and below traffic category as per design chart and Clause 7.3.3 of IRC: SP:72:2015. A webinar on this subject has already been done and all the doubts regarding its implementation have been cleared. It is now possible to have a totally mechanized process of black top surface dressing, which is economical and gives better water resistant roads.
- vii. It is observed that in some of the proposals state has proposed BM layer for the roads having traffic category less than T9, State should correct the same in DPR & certify that BM has not been proposed for the roads designed with traffic less than T9 traffic category, otherwise the extra cost should be borne by the state under higher specification.
- viii. Earth work cost is on the higher side particularly in Cooch Behar, South 24 Parganas, Alipurdur, Nadia and Darjeeling districts. State should examine and rationalize it.
- ix. State has proposed gravel shoulders on both sides for a width of 1.875 m with thickness of 150 mm. As per IRC SP: 72:2015 para 9.2 gravel shoulders should be restricted to 1 m width on both sides for 100 mm thickness. The material for shoulder should be murrum/ gravel type, and not WBM material.
- x. Test results for GSB materials and carted soil are not attached to the DPRs. Chainage wise existing crust details need to be attached with the DPR along with the photographs of test pit. State should do the needful.
- xi. Base course is on the higher side in Jhargram, Nadia, Purba Medinipur and South 24 Parganas. State needs to explore the possibility of proposing CTB instead of conventional WBM/WMM.
- xii. In some of the DPRs design CBR of the sub-grade soil considered is less than 5%. As per IRC SP:72 2015 cl 4.2 (a) the strength of the subgrade for design should not be less than 5%, the existing crust should be stabilised to achieve a minimum design CBR of 5%.
- xiii. Overlay thickness over existing BT layer should be proposed as per Clause 2.2.3 of IRC: SP:72:2015.
- xiv. In some of the DPRs where BM provision has been made double tack coat is proposed. The provision of tack coat should be restricted to one layer i.e. on the top of the BM layer only. State should rectify the same.
- xv. State has proposed higher numbers of CD works, State needs to provide proper justification for each proposed CD. Wherever possible CDs should be retained with maintenance work/ repair if required.
- xvi. Hydrological survey data is missing in most of the DPRs, only the list of existing CD structures is given in chapter 6 of Hydrological survey. Information about Rainfall data, catchment area and time of concentration are missing in the DPR.
- xvii. It is observed in most of the DPRs that the CD portion has not been deducted from the length of the road in pavement related estimation, state should re-verify and correct such errors to avoid duplicity.
- xviii. It has been observed in some DPRs that the protection work proposed is not justifiable from the photographs and X section attached in the DPR. The State needs to reassess the requirement as per site condition and rationalize the proposed provisions (In 33 roads, avg. protection work cost > Rs 40 lakhs/km).

- xix. It is observed in the DPRs that the provision and cost of Pucca Drain are on the higher side. (WB10200, WB14260, WB14263, WB1788, WB15369). Needs to be justified.
- xx. In most of the DPRs a PCC overlay has been considered on the existing CC pavement. Since the design life of rigid pavement is higher than the flexible pavement, overlay or re-construction might not be required for all such cases. If there is any requirement, state should adopt other approaches such as Panelled Cement Concrete, Cell filled Concrete or ICBP etc.
- xxi. In some of the DPRs the cost towards utility shifting i.e. shifting of electric poles, telephone lines etc. is added which is not permitted from the programme fund. The cost for such provision should come under higher specification. State should ensure cost towards such heads is added under higher specification cost in OMMAS.
- xxii. In rate analysis, 15% is considered for overhead and contractor profit. It should be capped up to 12.5% or additional 2.5% (15%-12.5%) should be booked under higher specification charges (i.e. additional State Share).

8. Planning Audit

(a) Trace map ranking

76.20% of roads are falling under trace map ranking of 1 to 15, 22.2% roads are falling under trace map ranking of 16 to 50 and 1.6% roads are falling under trace map ranking 51 to 100. All proposals of Trace Map rank of more than 50 have been audited on satellite imagery. *7 proposals are for trace map rank > 50. State should forward the detailed justification for the same, road wise.*

(b) Target Allocation within State

State was asked to share the target sharing policy used in the state for distribution of total target length among 22 districts. *State needs to inform in writing as to what strategy has been adopted by them for allocation of targets to various districts.*

(c) Proposal Level Checks

All proposals are uploaded on GeoSADAK. Sample of 211 proposals was identified by NRIDA and audited for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III based on trace map > 50, length and earthen portion > 50% and high CUCPL rank. Out of 211 proposals, 20 needs slight modification and state should reconsider 41 proposals. PIUs have to provide detailed road wise justifications for the proposals "marked for reconsideration". In Purba Burdwan district, in two blocks, existing CC has been proposed for replacement with new CC. It is not mentioned whether new CC is being re-laid after demolition of existing pavement or over existing pavement. State should carefully adopt other new technology like panelled or cell filled concrete to achieve economy. Proper credit of existing pavement should be given.

(d) It has been noticed by Pre EC that some high priority roads have been excluded from the current batch. State should submit the evidence against each exclusion as part of the signed Pre

EC compliance. Wrongly excluded roads should be included back. This exercise should be done in all the blocks and especially the following blocks:

Block	Number of High Priority Roads Excluded	Block	Number of High Priority Roads Excluded
Kalchini	15	Shyampur-I	8
Uluberia-I	12	Suri-II	8
Saltora	11	Bhangar-I	7
Goalpokhar-II	8	Bongaon	7
Khoyrasol	8	Nowda	7
Kumargram	8	Panchla	7
Madarihat	8	Rajnagar	7

(e) Some proposals with majority of surface in good condition having PCI > 3 are not eligible under PMGSY-III. State should re-examine these roads.

9. R&D Technology

The state has proposed 453.22 Km (16.03%) under Mainstreaming Technology using Waste Plastic and cold mix technology, 74.62 km (2.64%) using other main streaming technology like CC block, steel slag for stabilization and 88.86 km (3.14%) using IRC Accredited Materials/ Technologies. State needs to propose more length using Waste plastic and Cold mix (1/3 of total proposed length). State should confirm Nano technology water proofing are not encouraged for BT layer only, as its quality control/ evaluation is difficult. State has proposed 384.84 km with CC pavement. State may propose some length using Cell Filled Concrete/ Panelled Cement Concrete. Other Mainstreaming Technology and IRC Accredited Technology needs to be increased substantially (minimum 10% and 5% respectively). State has been advised to propose adequate length at least 5% using IRC Accredited Technologies/ Materials as per guidelines. Also, cost comparison of conventional design and new technology needs to be provided. The State Government was also advised to avoid mechanical distribution of R&D targets to the PIUs. It should be strictly as per the requirement of the location. Surface dressing should be proposed for low traffic volume/ axle load category roads. The State was further asked to ensure the following: -

- i. They have to sign MoU with Technology Provider and NRIDA before physically starting the work for Performance Evaluation in all these cases.
- 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.

10. Maintenance

The State has proposed a 5-year routine maintenance cost of Rs.205.38 crore which is 9.30% of construction cost and Rs 310.42 crore which is 14.06% of construction cost for 6th year renewal

cost. State has been advised to have a relook on cost of renewal as it is on lower side. It should be 18 to 20% and needs to enhancement. State was also advised that the 6th year renewal cost should be accompanied by a post 5-year guarantee/maintenance period, and such cost should be a part of DPR.

11. Maintenance of roads under DLP

During 2020-21, against the liability of Rs. 121.59 crore, expenditure of Rs.77.19 crore has been done which is 63% of liability. For the current FY maintenance liability is Rs.121.31 crore. Till date state has not credited any amount in SRRDA's account. Funds received figure for DLP seems to be incorrect, therefore, state is requested to bifurcate and correct the fund received for roads under DLP out of total funds received. There was zero expenditure on 67% of roads during 2020-21. Unsatisfactory grading is 47% for maintenance works from period January, 2021 to June, 2021. The State was advised to take immediate corrective action and show improvement on this aspect. State has not updated expenditure data on OMMAS for renewal of roads. State should update the same on priority.

12. E-Marg

Out of total 3750 packages pushed in eMARG, 3576 packages are under DLP, 675 (19%) packages are pending for locking, 902 (25%) packages are pending for manual entry expenditure. 841 roads (29%) are pending for registration on eMARG App, 2544 roads (88%) pending for Routine Inspection (RI), 2724 road works (94%) are pending for Performance Evaluation (PE), 1232 packages are pending for payment for more than 12 months and payment of Rs.44.13 crore has been done using eMARG. The state was asked to take action for saturation on eMARG.

13. Financial Issues

- (a) Financial closure of 29 no of works are pending for more than 180 days as on 30.06.21. The State was asked to take immediate action and expedite pending financial closure of completed works.
- (b) State has not submitted bank interest verification reports from FY 2010-11 to 2017-18 and interest recovery of Rs.47.39 crore is still pending from bank. State should look into it.
- (c) Annual state budget of PMGSY is not being depicted in TRSY-07 report of PFMS and also expenditure incurred from incentive money is not being transferred to new heads. State may examine both the issues.
- (d) Bank Guarantees have been expired and huge demand of TDS is outstanding. Amount of Rs.140.05 crore credited by bank but not entered in OMMAS. There is heavy balance in saving accounts of both programme and admin funds (which need to be converted to FDs) and stale cheques of Rs.28.26 crore are pending.

14. Quality

- (a) As per geo referenced field lab details on OMMAS, 564 packages are in progress and in 57 packages labs are not yet established.

(b) Number of active SQMs are 40 against requirement of 114. During 2021-22 5260 SQM inspections are targetted and till date 297 inspections conducted. There are 75 works not inspected even once and out of which 56 are more than 12 months old.

(c) Anomalies of SQM Inspections:

(i) No adequate cushion and no proper protection work have been provided on the RCC slab culvert; condition of cross drainage is disturbed [steel bars could be seen coming out of the edges] (Package No. WB01407)

(ii) For WBM G-III gradation 53 mm sieve passing range is 95-100%; it can be observed in photo that weight retained on 53 mm are in large quantity which is against the permissible range (Package no. WB22-06)

(iii) Improper pit size has been excavated to check the gradation of base course and Sub Grade (Package No. WB22-01 and WB09239)

(iv) Thickness of BT layer have been checked by keeping the eroded metal in hand [not sufficient cake] (Package no. WB16385)

(v) Night inspection have been conducted. (Package No. WB09260)

15. Progress of PMGSY Works

The details of works sanctioned, completed and pending under PMGSY-I & II are as below:

Name of Scheme	Balance works			Unawarded works		
	No. of roads	Length in Km	LSBs	No. of roads	Length in Km	LSBs
PMGSY-I	365	576.03	33	8	40	1
PMGSY-II	166	293.33	23	2	6	3

Annual physical target for the State is 1500 Km of road length and State has completed road length of 117 km till date. State has furnished month wise action plan for completion of balance PMGSY-I and II road works and LSBs. As regarding unawarded works, there are 10 unawarded works out of which 9 works will be dropped after obtaining the dropping proposal from PIU and for the remaining 1 work approval from the Finance Department is being solicited as the construction cost is more than 10 crores & technically qualified bidders are less than 3 nos.

16. Governance issues

State has informed that there is sufficient staff available at SRRDA and PIU level corresponding to balance and anticipated work in hand, including roads under maintenance. The vacancy due to service rules/ benefits at SRRDA/ PIUs are continuously filled up time to time. There are

fully dedicated 36 divisions having Executive Engineer, Assistant Engineer and Junior Engineer throughout the State to execute the various jobs related to PMGSY.

(a) **SQMs:** State has intimated that present strength of SQM is 40 excluding 2 DWOs. Appointment of 26 new SQMs is under process and this will increase the strength to 68. State further informed that keeping in mind the future work load no of SQMs will be sufficient. In new pool of SQMs, personnel having knowledge of bridge works are being engaged.

(c) **Bridge Expert:** State was advised for engaging the services of bridge expert/bridge consultant for proper planning, execution and field monitoring & supervision of bridge works under PMGSY. State representative intimated that enrolling is under process.

(d) **QMC:** State informed that QMC is already formed with one executive Engineer (Retired), two Assistant Engineers, two Junior Engineers and one DEO. Strength seems to be less w.r.t. the number of inspection reports that the it would need to examine. State was further advised to strengthen the QMC.

(e) **System of contracting:** All the works should be tendered and awarded as stipulated in fresh guidelines dated 22 December, 2020 issued by the Ministry. As per the guidelines the works should commence in 72 days from the date of sanction of works by this Ministry.

17. 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.
