

File No. P-17024/7/2019-RC (FMS-369625)

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

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 4th August, 2020

MINUTES

Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III, submitted by the State Government of Punjab for the 2020-21 (Batch-II)-reg.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on **24th July, 2020 at 11 AM** under the Chairpersonship of Additional Secretary (RD) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Punjab under PMGSY-III for the year 2020-21 (Batch-I).

2. It is requested that a compliance report on all the observations of the Committee may be sent to Ministry/NRIDA.


(Anurag Bhatnagar)
Assistant Commissioner (RC)
Tel: 011-23381343

Distribution:-

1. The Principal Secretary, Public Works (R&B) Department, Government of Punjab, Mini Secretariat, Sector-9, Chandigarh- 14300. [mail: secy.pw @punjab.gov.in]
2. The Chief Engineer, Punjab Roads & Bridges Development Board, S.C.S. 61-62, 1st floor, Phase – II, Mohali (Chandigarh), Punjab. [mail: ce.prbdb@punjab.gov.in]
3. All Directors, NRIDA.

Copy for information to:-

PPS to Secretary (RD)/PPS to AS & FA/PPS to AS (RD)/ PPS to JS (RC) New Delhi

Minutes of the Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on 24th July, 2020 to consider the project proposals submitted by Government of Punjab under PMGSY III, Batch I, 2020-21.

A Meeting of the Pre Empowered Committee (Pre-EC) through VC was held on 24th July, 2020 at 11 AM under the Chairpersonship of Addl. Secretary, Department of Rural Development & DG (NRIDA) to consider the proposals of the State of Punjab for PMGSY-III, Batch I of 2020-21. Following officials were present in the meeting.

Smt. Alka Upadhyaya	Addl. Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA
Dr Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary (RC), MoRD
Miss Mamta	Joint Director (RC), MoRD
Shri. B. C. Pradhan	Director (Tech), NRIDA
Shri I.K Pateriya	Director, NRIDA
Shri Kailash Bisht	Deputy Director (F&A), NRIDA
Shri Harsh Niasr	Data Scientist, NRIDA
State Govt. Representatives	
Sh. Vikas Pratap, IAS	Principal Secretary, Public Works
Sh. Mukesh Kumar Goel	Chief Engineer, SRRDA, Punjab
Sh. Sher Mohammad	General Manager-cum-SQC PMGSY Punjab
Sh. V.J.S Dhindsa	Chief Engineer, Punjab PWD B&R, Patiala
Sh. B.S.Dhanoa	Chief Engineer, Punjab Mandi Board, SAS Nagar
Sh. Santokh Singh	ITNO
Sh. Deep Chand	Manager (Accounts)
Sh. Karamjit Singh	Deputy Director (IT)

2. Current Proposal of the State Govt. under PMGSY-III, Batch-I of 2019-20

A presentation on the proposal submitted by the State was made by NRIDA before the Pre-Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:-

As per State's proposal dated 10.7.2020					Current proposal as per OMMAS as on 23.7.2020			
Item	No of Roads	Length	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)	No of Roads	Length	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost
Up-gradation	98	1046.16 km	781.40	74.69	98	1046.16 km	781.40	74.69 Lakh/km
LSBs	16	612.05 m	40.50	6.62	16	612.05 m	40.50	6.62 Lakh/m
Total	114	1046.16 Km roads+ 612.05m LSBs	821.90		98 roads 16 LSBs	1046.16 Km roads+ 612.05m LSBs	821.90*	

*MoRD Share: Rs. 492.63 Crore
State Target for PMGSY III: 3362.5 Km

State Share: Rs. 329.27 Crores
Sanctioned: Nil

All proposals have been scrutinized by STA, however PTA scrutiny of at least 10% of the proposal are yet to be done.

i. Carriageway width wise and Average cost wise details of road

15 roads of 150.41 km are 3.75 m wide with an average cost of Rs 68.23 lakhs/km, 82 roads of 887.99 km are 5.5 m wide with an average cost of Rs. 75.94 lakhs/km and 1 road of 7.76 km are 7 m wide with an average cost of Rs 56.74 lakh/km.

ii. Length wise details of road

Out of 98 roads (1046.16 km), 97 roads (1041.24 km) are of more than 5 km length at an average cost of Rs 74.68 lakh/km), and 1 road (4.92 km) are of 4-5 km at an average cost of Rs 77.64 lakh/km. There are many high ranking/utility roads with eligible length between 4 to 5 km which were not considered by the State in the current batch to take up proposals greater than 5 km.

iii. Traffic wise details of road

In 3.75 m carriageway width, 10 roads of 102.08 km are in T5 to T8 category and 5 roads of 48.32 km are in T9 category. In 5.5 m carriageway width, 5 roads of 54.44 km are in T5 to T8 category, 68 roads of 726.91 km are in T9 category and 9 roads of 106.63 km are in IRC 37 category. In 7 m carriageway width 1 road of 7.76 km are in IRC 37 category.

State should explain the reasoning behind high average cost of roads of 3.75 m and 5.5 m carriageway width under low traffic (T5 to T8 and T9) in comparison to average cost of roads of 5.5 m and 7 m carriageway width under high traffic (IRC 37).

iv. District wise details of roads

There are 22 districts and 150 blocks in Punjab against which 12 districts and 75 blocks have been covered in the current proposal. *State has reported that other districts could not be covered in the present batch because of issues of land availability etc. State has ensured that there would be better coverage of districts and blocks in the next batch of the proposal.*

District wise cost analysis shows that average cost of roads under different carriageway width in Fatehgarh Sahib, Hoshiarpur, Patiala and Sangrur are higher in comparison to other districts especially Jalandhar. *To address the high cost issue, Pre EC suggested that State should adopt RQI wherever suitable rather than going for strengthening or upgradation depending upon the road conditions. State should give clarification on this.*

3. DPR Issues

Following DPR issues were presented for consideration before Pre EC:

- i. Provision of raising of existing roads by 25-35% in maximum DPRs appears to be on higher side and it should be rationalized. *Pre EC observed that raising of existing roads may be leading to high cost which should be re-examined. Hard shoulders are also not allowed in the proposed roads.*
- ii. Providing and laying brick on end edging of road need to be deleted or should come from State share. *Responding to the Pre EC observation, State explained that because of the movement of heavy farm machinery, brick laying is required and therefore it may be allowed.*
- iii. Width provided for base and binding layer should be equal to carriageway width. i.e. 3.75m for single lane and 5.5m for intermediate lane road. *State was requested to comply with the observation.*
- iv. For requirement of overlay thickness clause 2.2.3 of IRC:SP:20 should be followed giving due weightage to existing pavement composition and thickness. *State agreed to look into the matter and comply with the observation.*
- v. Length of existing bridge and slab culverts should be deleted from the pavement quantity to avoid duplicity.
- vi. Cost on provision for bus Lay byes needs to be deleted or should come in state share only. *Since this is an additional provision, Pre-EC decided to assess the matter after having internal discussion in the Ministry and NRIDA.*
- vii. Two layer of tack coat is provided for the roads where BM is proposed. Provision of 1 layer of tack needs to be deleted, i.e. tack coat should not be provided along with prime coat and BM layer should be

directly laid on prime coat where WBM overlay has been proposed. *State has agreed to comply with the observation.*

viii. Provision of RCC drains may be replaced with PCC drains. *State has agreed to comply.*

ix. Higher no of CDs proposed. State needs to explore the possibility of maintaining existing good CDs with minor repairs instead of reconstruction, wherever possible. *In this regard, State was requested to explore the provision of CC drain instead brick machinery drain and make the suitable substitution.*

x. Maximum portion of roads seems to be in good condition, while it is scarified to a depth of 150mm. This scarification will lead to the disturbance in existing compacted pavement layer. *Pre-EC suggested that good condition roads should not go for scarification rather strengthening and RQI should be adopted.*

xi. As per PMGSY-III guidelines, road safety audit should be done on all roads with a length of 5 km & more.

xii. For traffic more than 1 MSA, third party traffic survey and axle load survey needs to be attached in the DPR. *State informed that they are not undertaking traffic survey during the month of June, July, and August being lean season. They are planning to do the traffic survey during the peak season to capture the actual data on traffic. Responding to this, Pre EC suggested that traffic survey takes into account such factor by extrapolation and state should conduct the survey now otherwise sanction of the proposal will be delayed.*

xiii. As per IRC:SP:20 below 1.0 m dia. pipe culverts should be avoided. State has provided 300mm, 450mm & 600mm dia pipe culverts. State may simply provide buried pipe conduit at these locations. *State agreed to comply with the observation.*

xiv. Provision of CC pavement needs to be replaced by flexible pavement in open area. Provision of cat's eye should be given only at the accidental prone areas, such as sharp curves, intersection points etc. No need to provide 200 m stone along with the location of 1 km stone and similarly 1 km stone along with 5km stone. Need correction in road furniture accordingly. *Pre EC suggested that road signs, furniture and other road safety measures should be adopted as per PMGSY III guidelines.*

4. Trace Map Ranking

60 roads i.e. 61% of the proposals are in the top 15% trace map ranking and 89 roads i.e. 91% are in top 50% ranking as shown in the following table. Low rank roads were also checked on satellite and found to be TR/MRL network-wise.

Min. Trace Map	Numbers	%
1 to 15	60	61%
16 to 50	29	30%
51 to 100	7	7%
> 100	2	2%
Total	98	

5. Planning Audit Compliance

i. Under planning Audit, 30 Blocks were sent for re-do of habitation mapping. 15 Blocks were requested to re-do their PCI survey. For Pre-EC a sample of the rejected blocks were rechecked for their compliance; and 3 Blocks namely Bhawanigarh, Samana and Sunam were rejected on account of unsatisfactory habitation mapping and requested to redo habitation mapping of all TR/MRL and regenerate CUCPL as per PMGSY-III Guidelines.

ii. There are 3 roads with Weighted PCI > 2 (good condition), but average cost proposed is more than 50 lakhs/km. DPR for these roads to be re-scrutinized by SRRDA level and ATR to be submitted.

iii. Another 4 roads with PCI > 2 are eligible only for RQI, but average cost proposed is more than 50 lakhs/km. SQC report of these roads to be submitted and proposed cost and DPR need to be checked. CBR has not been mentioned, Post 5 year Maintenance not considered, Checklist Not filled etc.

6. Maintenance

State has proposed Rs 4830.99 lakhs (6.18% of Construction Cost) for 5 years Routine Maintenance and Rs 11,019.66 lakhs (14.1% of Construction Cost) for 6th year's renewal to be borne by State Govt. State was advised to increase the 6th year's Renewal cost to 18% and more as per the guideline.

7. R&D technology

State has proposed 89 roads of 370.01 km using various new technologies as indicated below:

Technology	No of Roads	Length in Km
Waste Plastic	64	340.49
Mechanical stabilisation	1	13.02
CC block*	19	15.06
Roller compacted concrete	5	1.44
Total	89	370.01

* CC Block cannot be considered as new technology

Committee has agreed to the State's proposal of 104.6 km (33.93%) under Mainstreaming of Technology. However, State was advised to propose at least 5% length under IRC Accredited Materials/Technologies as per the PMGSY III guidelines which is nil in the present proposal.

8. Maintenance under DLP – Financial (As reported by State)

State has spent Rs 46.26 crore (57%) over the last 7 years on roads under DLP. However, during FY 2020-21, no expenditure has been incurred on DLP roads so far. Overall Unsatisfactory % based on NQM inspections on roads under DLP during the last 2 years is 0%. State was suggested to get the adequate fund for maintenance as stipulated in PMGSY III guidelines.

(Rs. in crore)

Year (s)	Amount required as per Contract	Amount Credited in account of SRRDA	Amount Utilized by SRRDA	% Expenditure w.r.t maintenance funds Required	Unsatisfactory % based on NQM inspections (Under DLP)		
					Total Nos.	“U” Nos.	U %
2014-15	7.64	9.06	7.60	99%	7	2	28.57%
2015-16	8.00	1.04	4.63	58%	41	3	7.32%
2016-17	10.00	0.69	3.70	37%	16	0.00	0.00%
2017-18	12.75	4.67	8.18	64%	16	4	25.00%
2018-19	14.00	10.06	14.15	101%	33	1	3.03%
2019-20	13.85	8.00	7.99	58%	33	0	0%
2020-21 (as on date)	14.40	0.00	0.00	0%	0	0	0%
Total:	80.64	46.26	46.25	57%	146	10	6.85%

9. e-MARG Status

There are total 266 workable packages against which 222 packages have been locked and payment of Rs 0.59 lakhs has been made under only 1 package due to non release of funds to SRRDA as reported by the state. As against 114 contractors, 90 contractors have been registered so far. e-Marg onboarding should be completed soon as this module will be used for monitoring of maintenance under PMGSY III.

10. Fund Position

State should look into the following points with regard to financial matter and take action to resolve the same.

- i. Out of 5 works pending for financial closure, 4 works (80%) are pending for more than 180 days.
- ii. Audited Balance Sheet of Maintenance fund for F.Y 2018-19 is not yet submitted by state.
- iii. State share of Rs 283.48 crore is pending to be released to SRRDA from State treasury as on 24-07-2020.

11. State should send the compliance on the observations made by Pre-EC in the foregoing paras so that revised proposal of Punjab under PMGSY III, Batch I, 2020-21 would be placed before Empowered Committee for consideration and recommendation at the earliest.

Meeting ended with Vote of Thanks to the Chair.