

**No.P-17024/26/2020-RC (FMS No. 370347)**

**Government of India**

**Ministry of Rural Development**

**Department of Rural Development**

KrishiBhavan, New Delhi

Dated the 28<sup>th</sup> September, 2020

**Minutes**

**Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee (Pre-EC) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Uttar Pradesh under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) for the 2020-21 (Batch-I)-reg.**

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Pre- Empowered Committee held on 21<sup>st</sup> September, 2020 through Video Conferencing (VC Code:- 304430) to consider the project proposals for Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action. The State Government is requested to furnish compliance on the observations of Pre-EC on priority.



(Lalit Kumar)

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India

Tel. No. 011-2338 2406

**Distribution:**

- (i) The Principal Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Bappu Bhawan, Schivalaya, Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow:- 226001.
- (ii) The Chief Executive Officer, UPRRDA, Lucknow.
- (iii) The Chief Engineer, Department of Rural Development, Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Bappu Bhawan, Schivalaya, Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow:- 226001.
- (iv) All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5th Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066.

**Copy to:-**

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

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 22<sup>nd</sup> SEPTEMBER, 2020 AT 12:30 PM TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY THE STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH UNDER PMGSY-III, (BATCH-I, 2020-21)**

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee was held through Video Conferencing on **22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2020 at 12:30 PM** under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Uttar Pradesh under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) (Batch-I) of 2020-21. Following officials were present in the meeting.

<b>Dr Ashish Kumar Goel</b>	<b>Joint Secretary, (RC), MoRD &amp; DG, NRIDA</b>
Shri K.M.Singh	Deputy Secretary (RC), MoRD
Shri. B C Pradhan	Consultant (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Dr. I.K.Pateriya	Director (P.II&III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agarwal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
<b>State Govt. Representatives</b>	
Shri Manoj Kumar Singh	Additional Chief Secretary, RD & Panchayati Raj
Shri Sujeet Kumar	Chief Executive Officer, UPRRDA
Shri R. B.K Rakesh	Chief Engineer, UPRRDA
Shri Brijesh Dubey	SQC, UPRRDA
Shri Raj Kumar Shukla	Financial Controller, UPRRDA
Shri D D Pathak	Senior Engineer Technical, UPRRDA
Shri Mohammad Murtaza	ITNO, UPRRDA

**2. Details of Proposal**

Item	Current proposal as per OMMAS as on 20.9.2020			
	No of Roads	Length	Cost (Rs in Crore)	Avg. Cost
Up-gradation	1208	8775.613 km	7742.86	88.23 Lakh/km
LSBs	1	33.6 m	1.91	5.69 Lakh/m
<b>Total</b>	1208 roads 1 LSBs	8775.61 Km roads+ 33.6m LSBs	7744.77*	

**\*MoRD Share: Rs. 4,644.69 Crore State Share : Rs. 3,100.08 Crore (Includes Rs.3.63 Crore higher specification cost)**

The State of Uttar Pradesh has been allocated a target of 18,937.5 Km under PMGSY-III. The first batch of proposals submitted by the State includes 1208 roads of 8,775.61 Km and 1 bridge of value Rs. 7,742.86 crore. During the meeting, the State representative intimated that proposals for 4 roads and 4 bridges have further been added and as such, the first batch of proposal of State

now comprises of 1,212 roads and 5 bridges. There is no left-out bridge proposal under this batch. As LSBs were added later on, it needs to be examined separately by NRIDA.

Out of 1,208 roads, the State has proposed 24 roads of 3.00 m carriageway width (145.2 km) at an average cost of Rs. 15.94 lakh/ km, 889 roads of 3.75 m carriageway width (6,162.17 km) at an average cost of Rs. 69.02 Lakh/ km and 295 roads of 5.50 m carriageway width (2,467. 58 Km) at an average cost of Rs. 140.08 Lakh/ km. It was clarified by the State Government that proposals of 24 roads under 3.00 m carriageway width are for riding quality improvement. 1,178 roads and 1 bridge have been scrutinized by STAs. However, PTA scrutiny has not been done for any proposals.

**At the outset, it was seen that average cost of roads with 3.75 m carriageway width and 5.5 meter carriageway width was on higher side when compared with the average cost of other states. State officials informed that the average cost is on par with the similar roads sanctioned to the states under PMGSY-III. State officials further informed that since the construction material of roads is to be carried from very far off places, the cost of construction has increased. Also, some other factors like widening & strengthening, provision of CC roads in habitation stretch, side drain and retaining wall have contributed in this higher average cost. Also average costs of the roads in some districts were even higher than that of others. State Government officials assured to examine the outliers afresh.**

### **3. DPR Issues**

- State needs to provide copy of SLSC approval, Mandatory certificates and MoU for maintenance duly signed by competent authority. The State was asked to obtain SLSC approval once again in respect of the cases where the SLSC approval was obtained before approval of the proposal by the Zila Panchayats.
- State needs to provide Hon'ble MP's consent letter as per Ministry's advisory dated 02.06.2020 along with MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats duly signed by the competent authority.
- State needs to provide a certificate that no PMGSY road has been proposed in current batch within the design life of 10 years.
- Design stage Road Safety Audit details needs to be provided for the roads proposed more than 5 km length as per PMGSY-III guidelines.
- Proper transect walk photographs, transect walk summary have not been attached to the DPRs. Also, transect walk summary/ Minutes and copy of Gram Sabha approval has not been attached to the DPRs, which needs to be provided.

- Test results for GSB materials are not attached to the DPRs
- Third-Party Traffic Survey and axle load survey needs to be attached for traffic more than 1 MSA. It was advised that this could be even done before award of the actual works.
- Available existing crust details are not provided in the DPRs. Since these are up-gradation proposal, overlay provision need to be provided only after evaluation of existing pavement layers as per Clause 6.2 along with Clause 2.3 of IRC;SP;72;2015.
- Section wise CBR value not given. In most of the roads CBR of the existing sub grade is shown as less than 5%, therefore while designing the pavement thickness appropriate soil stabilisation method should be adopted to improve the sub grade CBR as per IRC SP:72 2015 for both in widening portion and existing carriageway so as to achieve economy.
- As regards the proposal of brick on edges on both side of road and Brick soling, State was asked to carry out cost comparison of brick on edges on both sides and brick soling with that of hard shoulder of 100mm thick using selected soil of CBR>10% and propose the former only if the rates are comparable. For this purpose the cost estimates of other states like Punjab may be seen for comparison.
- Slab culverts portion needs to be deducted in pavement quantity to avoid duplication of quantities.
- Curve and junction design calculation need to be provided and quantity should be taken according the actual design calculation.
- Lump sum amount of 20% extra quantity in WBM for potholes need to be deleted. Since these are upgradation proposal with granular overlay after scarification of existing BT course. There is no need of filling up the pot holes separately. However, some quantity may be provided towards profile correction depending upon the extent of damage. Actual quantity need to be used after field survey. GSB material should be used in place of WBM where the existing crust available is treated as GSB. In summary, DPR should be based on actual field survey and assessment and not based on generalised formula.
- Cost of material seems to be very high. It was informed that SoR of July 2020 has been used. State need to send the SOR to NRIDA for approval and approved SOR rates need to be used. NRIDA was asked to examine the issue in detail taking into account the minutes of pre-EC and EC of the proposals of PMGSY-II of the state. Also, the DPRs of PWD of the State should also be seen if the same rates of material have been used for road construction from state budget, especially with regard to lead distance being used for various districts. It could be seen that source from which lead are being obtained for constructions of road by PWD of the state government for faster processing, a certificate from the State PWD may also be obtained stating the names and distance of quarries being used for various districts.
- The cost of pavement materials is too high due to provision of higher lead

distance of the order 200-300 km. As per advisory issued by NRIDA "Measures for achieving economy in construction of Rural Roads", if the lead distance is exceeding to 50 km, use of locally available marginal materials should be explored in order to achieve economy in construction.

- As per pictures attached there are electric poles existing near the carriageways. State need to ensure proper shifting of utilities so that there is no safety issue afterward. It should be done from state share and uploaded on OMMAS accordingly.
- In most of the DPRs retaining walls proposed are not justified from the photographs attached and the X section. The State needs to reassess the requirement as per site condition and rationalise the provision proposed.
- 85% escalation is added for machinery in analysis of rate. This needs to be examined in detail by NRIDA.
- In most of the DPRs provision of U shape drain appears to be in higher side. Pucca drains should only be proposed in the habitation length. Accordingly, provision for pucca drain needs to be rationalised and proposed as per site requirement. State was also asked to attach GIS Map for verifying the portions taken in DPR for CC road and U drain.
- As per IRC SP: 72:2015 up to T9 traffic, surface course OGPC followed with SC is allowed but the State has proposed provision for SDBC. The over and above cost for SDBC from OGPC+SC should be borne by the State and these additional cost needs to be added under higher specification cost.
- For bringing economy in construction Cell Filled concrete/ Panelled Cement concrete and other such technology could be explored for CC works.
- 6th year renewal cost should be 18 to 20% of project cost but in DPR it is very low.

#### **4. Governance issues at SRRDA**

State Government to furnish inputs on following points pertaining to Governance issues at SRRDA/ PIUs:-

- Governance related issues like staff strength at SRRDA and PIU level. Whether sufficient staff is available at SRRDA & PIUs. What are the vacancies at SRRDA/ PIUs and how and when they would be filled? Availability of staff should be commensurate with works in hand and anticipated. The execution and management capacity in terms of staff and infrastructure should be explained and justified. If there are any deficiencies then measures to accelerate them should also be spelt out.
- Strength of technical wing involved in preparation and scrutiny of DPRs proposals- whether sufficient manpower and expertise exists?
- Capability for design and execution of bridge works and their supervision during the construction.
- Mechanism of SQM inspections and availability of expert staff at SRRDA to

vet their reports. Whether strength of SQMs is adequate for carrying out required number of inspections as per guidelines, keeping in mind works in progress and new sanctions over the coming years. Separate SQMs should be empanelled for inspection of bridge works.

- Forest / Land issues involved in current proposals or previous works in hand.
- System of contracting: How many days SRRDA is taking in award of sanctioned works and what measures is it taking to reduce the time taken for various processes: from the date of sanction to actual publishing of NIT, evaluation, award, agreement, and actual start on ground. The state must commit to specific timelines in EC for these processes.

## 5. Planning

(i) Allocation under PMGSY-III (18,937.5 Km) for the State is around 8.40% of the State's DRRP length, which is 2.25 lakh km. Proposals of 7 aspirational districts namely Siddharathnagar, Fatehpur Balrampur, Chandauli, Chitrakoot, Shrawasti and Sonebhadra are covered in the current batch. However, it has been observed that the target allocated to these districts is less than 5% of their DRRP length and in some cases it is as low as 2%. State Government should indicate their target allocation strategy at District level. State was also asked to re-look the target allocation to Aspirational Districts. It was also apprised to the State representatives that as per the programme guidelines, priority has to be given to connect/upgrade rural roads leading to SAGY villages (provided they follow PMGSY-III guidelines otherwise).

(ii) The length-wise proposal details are as under:-

SI No	Items	No of roads	Length in km	Cost in Crore	Average cost/Km
1	4 to 5 Km	02	9.34	6.38	68.30
2	More than 5	1206	8766.27	7736.47	88.25
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1208</b>	<b>8775.61</b>	<b>7742.85</b>	<b>88.23</b>

(iii) 90% of the proposal is for upgradation of the existing BT surface. Therefore, corresponding cost should be on lower side.

(iv) In some proposals of Gorakhpur, Farrukhabad, Banda and Jaunpur districts, it has been observed that the PCI value of the proposed roads is more than 2 and the roads are primarily in good condition, the road has low traffic volume and no widening of existing BT is involved, yet the cost of such roads are more than Rs. 75 lakh/km. The State was advised to get the DPR re-scrutinized by higher officials in SRRDA. Similar such examples need to be re-examined by SRRDA before EC.

**V. Observations on DPRs regarding road safety & RSA reports:**

Section	Item	Observations
2.2	Strip Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Road safety hazards not marked</li> <li>● Does not indicate road width at critical locations</li> <li>● Does not show horizontal alignment</li> </ul>
2.5	Transect Walk	Safety concerns of Community not discussed (This is important, community must be involved, made aware)
8.2	Horizontal Alignment	Table 8.2 not filled; many curves observed in photographs. Design of horizontal curves cannot be ascertained/evaluated.
8.4	Design of Junctions	Table 8.4 not filled; Many junctions are marked on Strip Plan but junction designs (these are critical locations for safety) are not provided.
14	Embedding Safety measures in DPR	No project road safety provisions discussed; Checklist of Road Safety Measures is filled Mechanically (responses not substantiated by provisions in the DPR).
RSA Report		Not submitted. In any case, the details in DPR are insufficient to undertake Design stage Road Safety Audit.

**6. Maintenance**

State has proposed maintenance cost of 8.45% which is agreeable and 6 years Renewal cost of 12.77 % which needs to be increased to 18% & above.

**7. R&D Proposals.**

State has proposed construction of 82 roads 548.11 km (6.25%) using green technology as per the following details:-

S.No	Technology	No of Roads	Length in Km
<b>1</b>	<b>IRC Main stream Technology</b>		
2	Waste Plastic	147	710.67
3	Lime stabilisation	26	181.10
	<b>Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>891.77</b>
	<b>IRC accredited new Technology</b>		
3	Nano Technology for water proofing	<b>74</b>	<b>531.48</b>
4	Zycosoil Nano-technology	<b>8</b>	<b>16.63</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>548.11</b>

Out of these, 10.58% of total road length has been proposed using Main stream

technology, against minimum requirement of 10% and the roads proposed using IRC accredited technology is 6.50% against minimum requirement of 5%. The State was advised to avoid mechanical distribution of R&D targets to the PIUs. It should strictly be in accordance with needs and local requirement. State was also advised to furnish break-up of IRC accredited technology road-wise with justification. It was also advised that only such technologies be used, which render themselves for proper impact/ performance evaluation.

**8. Maintenance of roads under DLP**

Against maintenance liability of Rs. 423.57 crore during the period 2015-16 to 2020-21, the SRRDA received Rs.588.12 crore, but only Rs. 230.55 crore were spent. The State Government needs to focus on maintenance of the roads, and ensure full expenditure takes place on roads under DLP and 6<sup>th</sup> year renewals.

**9. e-Marg**

Progress of the State on boarding e-marg needs impetus. Out of 1830 total workable packages, only 1391 have been locked and payment using e-marg has been done only in 236 packages. Further, against 673 contractors, only 501 are registered so far. State was advised to expedite the on-boarding e-Marg as it will be used for monitoring of maintenance contracts and all manual payment will be discontinued.

**10. Quality.**

5 works of more than 12 months have not been inspected by SQM even once, out of payment of more than Rs. 10 lakh has been made on 1 work. 2 ATRs of NQM observations in respect of Completed works and 2 ATRs of Ongoing works are pending with the State. Unsatisfactory grading is 3.23% for completed works, 4.69% for ongoing works and 21.81% for maintenance works. The State was advised to take corrective action for improvement in U% in respect of maintenance works.

**11. Financial issues**

- (i) Interest income not yet transferred to Programme Fund Account.
- (ii) Bank Interest verification certificate for the financial year 2019-20 not yet received.
- (iii) The State has not yet submitted OMMAS based Audited Balance Sheet of Maintenance fund for the year 2018-19.
- (iv) Financial closure of 25 physically completed work are pending in the State, out of these 4 bills of physically completed works of more than six month old. The State was asked to take immediate action.

**12.** 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.

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

\*\*\*\*