

File No. P-17024/12/2021-RC (eFMS-374852)

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

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 14th September, 2022

MINUTES

Subject: Minutes of the Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee held on 5th September, 2022 to discuss project proposals of State of Jharkhand under PMGSY-III (Batch-I, 2022-23)-reg.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on **5th September, 2022 at 03:00 PM** under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA (**through Video Conferencing**) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State of Jharkhand under PMGSY-III (Batch-I, 2022-23).

2. State is requested to furnish the compliance of the Pre-EC to Ministry/NRIDA for conducting the EC on time.

(K.M. Singh)

Deputy Secretary to the Govt. of India
Tel. No. 011-23070308

Distribution:

- i. The Secretary-cum-Chief Executive Officer, Rural Works Department, Jharkhand State Rural Roads Development Agency, F.F.P Building, 2nd Floor, Dhurwa, Ranchi- 834004
- ii. Chief Engineer, JSRRDA
- iii. All Directors in NRIDA.

Copy for information to:-

PPS to AS (RD)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 5th SEPTEMBER, 2022 AT 03.00 PM TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF JHARKHAND UNDER PMGSY-III (BATCH-I), 2022-23

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (EC) was held through Video Conference on **5th September, 2022 at 03.00 PM** under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG (NRIDA) to consider the proposal of the State of Jharkhand under PMGSY-III (Batch-I) of 2022-23. 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 I.K.Pateriya	Director (P.III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agrawal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
State Government. Representatives	
Dr. Manish Ranjan	Secretary-cum-CEO, RWD, Jharkhand
Shri Jai Prakash Singh	Chief Engineer, JSSRDA
Shri Rajiv Lochan	Superintendent Engineer
Shri Subodh Kumar	Executive Engineer
Shri Praveen Kumar Jha	Bridge Expert, JSRRDA
Shri Dinesh Pradhan	Finance Controller, JSRRDA
Shri Manish Keshri	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	349	3172.614	1972.05	62.16
LSBs	155	5939.270	288.31	4.85
Total	349 roads + 155 LSBs	3172.614 km roads + 5939.27 m LSBs	2260.36	
*MoRD Share : Rs. 1356.22 Crore			State share: Rs. 904.14 Crore	
Target: 4125 km			Sanctioned- 979.351 km	

3.75 m width road - 344 Nos & Length – 3109 km - Rs. 61.47 Lakhs/km

5.50 m width road - 05 Nos & Length -- 63.19 km - Rs. 95.91 Lakhs/km

3. General Observations

- The State of Jharkhand has already been sanctioned 979.351 km under PMGSY-III.

ii) The current batch of proposals is for 349 number of roads of 3172.614 km and 155 LSBs. Out of 349 roads, 344 roads of 3109 km are proposed with 3.75 m width at a cost of Rs. 61.47 lakh/ km and 5 roads of 63.19 km is proposed with 5.50 m width at an average cost of Rs. 95.91 lakh/ km.

iii) All proposals have been uploaded and scrutinized by the STAs on OMMAS. PTA scrutiny has been done on 37 roads and 14 bridges. State was asked to conduct PTA scrutiny for 2 more LSBs.

iv) The balance target for the state under PMGSY-III is 3145.649 km and the state has proposed 26.965 km in excess of the balance target, and the same should be deleted.

4. Trace Map Cut- Quality of Roads

i) It was observed that 331 roads (95%) have trace map rank of 1-15 and 18 roads (5%) have trace map rank of 16-50. State has proposed maximum roads of high trace map rank.

5. Planning Audit

i) All the 349 roads and 155 LSBs have been uploaded on GEOSADAK. Out of 349 roads, 156 sample roads were audited by NRIDA team for their utility as TR/ MRL. Of the 152, in respect of 54 roads state was asked to give proper justification for their inclusion in the proposal and in respect of 12 roads, state was asked to carry out modification as suggested by NRIDA. NRIDA was asked to carry out audit of other roads also before EC meeting.

ii) It was observed that, out of 155 LSBs, 154 LSBs are located on PMGSY-III roads, however 1 LSB was not found to be on the alignment of PMGSY-III road. State was asked to provide justification for the same.

iii) State representative mentioned that, the roads which have been mentioned as track by NRIDA are actually badly damaged WBM roads and not gravel and moorum road as inferred by the PIUs. Committee mentioned that, predominantly only BT/CC roads are considered under PMGSY-III and roads which has non BT/CC on more than 25% of its surface is generally not taken as it can not be a major rural link/ through route. State representative mentioned that the badly damaged WBM roads may be considered as BT. ***Committee mentioned that, these roads can be considered as BT only if BT surface ever existed on the roads. State was asked to provide proper justification and evidence with revised proforma C in order to re-classify these roads to damaged BT. NRIDA was asked to allow the conversion only after proper evidence based verification.***

iii) Some of the roads flagged in the audit done by NRIDA team are as under-

- 91% of the road "T06-PWD Bakudi to PWD Bhawrabandh via Pokhariya, Udaypur" in Sahibganj district is new construction and is parallel to highway. State representative mentioned that the road connects the habitations to Agro -industries and a railway station and PHC also exist in between. Further, state mentioned that the road is not new construction but damaged BT. State was asked to clearly mention the surface status with proper evidence, clearance date, details of earlier sanction and expenditure, etc.
- In the road "T03-Bolba Samsera Kurpani" in Simdega district, no major population seem to exist along the non BT portion. Most of the road is passing through the forest area and is parallel to existing BT road. State however mentioned that, the road connects to the tribal population. State was advised to delete the proposal.
- "MRL14-LABGA TO SAUNDA BASTI VIA JAINAGAR" in Ramgarh district is parallel to BT road and mining/ coal washeries could be seen in the alignment. State representative mentioned that the road connects to state highway. The road also connects

Schools, Markets. State was asked to provide justification for the same. On the issue of mining washery falling on the alignment, state informed that, the does not lead to mining area. State was asked to submit evidence based justification.

- A portion of the road “T10-NH TO SH VIA BANDUA, PALHEA” in Latehar district is non BT and is not serving any purpose. State representative mentioned that the road connects a population of 4000 and also connects national highway and state highway. State was asked to delete the non-BT portion.
- A road “MRL15-SH T012 DUMARTOLI TO SH T012 BANDHTOLI VIA PISKA” in Ranchi district was observed to be serving brick kiln and also forming a loop. 41% non BT road has been proposed. State was asked to delete this road as it is not serving the required purpose. State agreed to the same.
- One road “MRL12-KARGE TO NH-75 KANDRI MORE” in Ranchi district is parallel to state highway. Habitation which will be benefitted by this road is already connected with other roads. State was asked to delete this road. State agreed to the same.
- One LSB over River at “Ch 4510m in Pandedih to Bhandaro Road under Jamua Block” is not falling in the alignment of proposed road “MRL05-Pandedih to Bhandaro” in Giridih district. Rather, LSB lies on some other alignment. State representative mentioned that, it has been wrongly marked on Geo Sadak, the LSB falls in the alignment of proposed road. State was asked to get it marked correctly on Geo Sadak after taking approval of higher authorities.

6. **Proposals with more than 15% variation in eligible length**

i) Following 13 roads have proposed length more than 15% of the eligible length:-

- MRL17-Laxmantunda to T03(Magargarhi)via Domawara
- MRL03-T01 RAJOGARI TO SOHGORA VIA PAHARI KALAN
- MRL03-RCD Road Lariadih to RCD Road Sonydih via Pathaldiha Salayya
- T06-T01 Kuju to T01 Rola via Dholadih, Shyamsundarpur, Jonbani, Bijadih
- T03-Supaidih to Kalajhariya via Bandajori, Jamuniyabad, Lakhanpur
- MRL12-Kaswar mMRL20 to Harizantola via Birajpur
- MRL13-Duar Pahari road T02 to Barhitannr
- MRL12-PATAGUIRA TO BARDAOOUR GANJRA
- MRL04-PWD Road Begamganj To PWD Road Atapur Via Chandser
- MRL19-T016 Baida Pahari to Parasbani
- MRL04-Sisai to Honhi
- MRL02-Nagar Untari To UP Border Via Garbandh
- MRL02-MERAL SAI TO TANGAR MORE.

State was asked to verify these roads physically and carry out necessary modifications.

7. **Existing Surface**

i) It was observed that 38 roads have BT/CC in 0-25% of its surface, 43 roads have BT/CC in 25-50% of its surface and 32 roads have BT/ CC in 50-75% of its surface. State was asked to provide justification for these 113 roads.

ii) Surface of 352.932 km was observed to be of WBM. State representative mentioned that, most of the WBM length is actually badly damaged BT, which will be corrected after evidence based verification. Further, surface of 30.911 km was observed to be of gravel, 72.561 km of moorum and 256.289 km was observed to be track road, which is the reason of such large percentage of non BT/ CC surface. State was asked to examine this and provide justification.

8. **High Priority Roads skipped in CUCPL**

- i) It was observed that, 31 high priority roads have been skipped due to ownership with different departments. Committee however observed that these roads should not be skipped until these are being constructed/ renewed/ upgraded by the owner department. State was asked to provide road-wise justification with proper documents.
- ii) 41 high priority roads have been skipped due to its sanction under state scheme. State was asked to submit the justification for the same with documentary evidence.
- iii) 26 high priority roads have been skipped due to non-issuance of forest clearance and 25 roads have been skipped due to land issue. Committee mentioned that, roads cannot be skipped just on this basis, as the state has enough time to sort out these issues till the completion period (March 2025) of PMGSY-III. All these roads should be analyzed and specific details to be given as to what are the issues and how will it be difficult to get forest clearance and resolve land dispute issues.

9. **Distribution of roads based on traffic category**

- i) It was observed that 240 roads (80%) have been categorized as T7, which seems to be a statistical anomaly. Such large percentage of proposed roads in T7 traffic category doesn't seem realistic. State was asked to examine it.

10. **PCU/ day details**

- i) It was observed that 119 roads have PCU/ day more than 2000. However the roads have not been proposed for widening to 5.5 m even after being categorized in such high traffic category (T7). *State was asked to conduct the traffic survey and axle load survey once again.* If these roads actually are of such high traffic category, then they should be proposed for widening.

11. **Distribution of roads based on widening to various carriageway**

- i) It was observed that, only 5 roads have been proposed for widening from 3.75 m to 5.5 m, other 344 roads have been proposed for upgradation with 3.75 m width only. Committee mentioned that, considering such large number of roads in T7 traffic category, very few roads have been proposed for widening. State representative mentioned that, not too many vehicles run on these roads, rather few but heavy vehicles run. *NRIDA clarified that T5-T9 traffic category govern for pavement design and not for width design. PCU governs for adoption of width. State was asked to revise the traffic category after re-surveying the roads (both traffic and axle-load). Then the roads with PCU more than 2000 may be proposed for widening to 5.5 m width.*
- ii) *Committee advised that, engineers of the state should read the basic IRC codes for better understanding of the concepts.*

12. **Average Cost Trends**

- i) It was observed that, the average cost of 5.5 m wide roads in 2021-22 was Rs. 80.97 lakh/ km and it is Rs. 95.91 lakh/ km in the current proposal. State was asked to justify the abnormal increase in average cost of roads. State representative mentioned that, the average cost of 5.5 m wide roads is 89.9 lakh/ km in the current proposal. It has been erroneously mentioned as Rs. 95.91 lakh/ km. State was asked to correct it on OMMAS.

13. **District wise details of current proposals**

- i) Pavement cost of 5.5 m wide road in Ranchi district is Rs. 89.29 lakh/ km, which was observed to be an outlier.

State was asked to analyze the reason for such high pavement cost and provide justification for the same.

14. **Pavement cost/ km wise details**

- i) It was observed that, 16 roads in 3.75 m width category have pavement cost more than Rs. 60 lakh/ km and 5 roads in 5.5 m width category have pavement cost more than Rs. 75 lakh/ km. *State was asked to analyze these roads and a team from NRIDA should also visit the state to examine these roads. The team will guide the state in correcting all the DPRs. State was asked to submit, how many of these roads have been proposed with new technology and how many with conventional technology.*

15. **Non-Pavement cost/ km wise details**

- i) It was observed that 62 roads in 3.75 m width category have non-pavement cost of more than Rs. 20 lakh/ km. State was asked to examine these roads.

16. **FDR Proposal**

- i) State has provisioned 114 roads of 1066.02 km with FDR technology. Committee mentioned that, the proposal will need to be revised if more roads are taken up for widening as per the new survey (traffic/ PCU). NRIDA was asked to examine the approach of the state in FDR. State was asked to share the rate analysis of FDR with NRIDA. *State representative mentioned that, from 20-25th September, 2022, they are going to conduct an experiment on FDR technology, like that done in the state of UP. Committee desired that, some officials from NRIDA should also visit the state.*

17. **Road DPR Observations**

- i) In package no. JH18ITG – 005, existing crust is reported as 100mm GSB & 150mm WBM, however credit for same has not been considered in Base layer (WMM) estimate. Overlay thickness of Base considered is 225 mm which should be reduced accordingly by the state after giving due credit to the existing crust as per IRC SP 72 2015.
- ii) It was observed that, the existing CC length 736.749 km and the state has proposed 689.25 km with paneled cement concrete. State was asked to propose balance length with new technology as well. State agreed to the same.
- iii) State had proposed 25 mm SDBC instead of OGPC + Seal Coat. State was asked to correct the same. Now the provision of OGPC + Seal coat has been made in DPRs by the state. However, the same still needs correction due to adoption of surface of dressing.
- iv) As per IRC SP: 72:2015, for surface course surface dressing is allowed for T-4 and T-5 traffic category but the State has proposed provision for OGPC in some DPRs. State was asked to correct the same and upload corrected performance C on OMMAS.

18. **Bridge DPR Observations**

- i) Design of superstructure is missing in the DPRs. Standard drawings of MoRTH have been attached and estimates have been calculated on that basis. State was asked to design the superstructure by adopting LSM.

19. **R&D Proposals**

- i) State has proposed only 81.60 km (7.44%) with surface dressing, which is very less compared to the NTV 2022 stipulation.
- ii) State has proposed 689.25 km (93.55%) with paneled cement concrete/ white topping. Committee asked the state to propose 100% road length with paneled cement concrete/ white topping/ cell filled concrete.
- iii) *State was advised to comply with the New Technology Vision Document 2022 while formulating the proposals.*

20. **Pending compliance of the State on previous clearances**

- i) It was observed that the state has not yet signed MoU with the Ministry. As per the guidelines of PMGSY-III, the state have to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India before tendering of the work for providing adequate funds for maintenance of roads constructed/ upgraded under PMGSY for initial five years routine maintenance, and for further five years routine maintenance including periodic renewal as per requirements. State was asked to take immediate action and send the signed physical copies of MoU to the Ministry at the earliest.
- ii) The State was asked to ensure installation of GPS system in key machinery and equipment engaged during execution of road works under PMGSY-III (covered in the clearance letter and also previously ongoing works) in terms of instruction issued by NRIDA vide letter dated 31st January, 2022. Committee asked the state to ensure installation of GPS before EC meeting. Further, committee made it clear to the state that, SRRRDA will pay for it and not the contractor.
- iii) The State was asked to ensure verification of quality control registers and uploading on OMMAS in terms of circular no. NRRDA-P014 (14) dated 13th January, 2022. State representative mentioned that, out of 228, 109 QCRs have been uploaded. *State was asked to upload the QCRs at the earliest. State was made clear that, no payment will be made on the packages for which QCRs have not been uploaded.*

21. **Physical Progress**

- i) It was observed that 22 roads of 175.72 km and 64 works of 402.89 km are still un-awarded under PMGSY-III and RCPLWEA respectively. State representative mentioned that only 2 roads under PMGSY-III and 3 roads & 15 LSBs under RCPLWEA remain to be awarded as on date. State was asked to award these works at the earliest.
- iii) The Annual Physical target allotted to the state is 1935 km, against which, state has so far completed only 65 km (3%). State was asked to increase the pace of construction, so as to achieve the annual target.
- iv) It was observed that, in the FY 2021-22, against the maintenance liability of Rs. 102.39 crore, expenditure of only Rs. 59.02 crore has been incurred by the state. State was asked to incur enough expenditure against the liability.
- v) The target for renewal was asked from the state. State representative mentioned that 2000 km road length will be renewed in this FY. It was however observed that only 115 km was renewed in the last FY. State was asked to adhere to the target of 2000 km for renewal this year. Further, it was observed that, renewal data has not been updated on OMMAS. State was asked to update the same.

22. eMarg

i) In eMarg, it was observed that 257 (7%) roads are pending for locking on eMarg, MEE is pending for 516 (13%) packages, routine inspection (RI) has been missed on 1499 packages and out of Packages with pending payment for >3 months, 1230 (46%) packages are pending for first payment. State was asked to look into it and improve the progress on eMarg. ***State representative mentioned that, most of the pendencies are due to NEAs. Committee desired that a meeting should be conducted with NEAs.***

ii) The expenditure done through eMarg in FY 2022-23 is Rs. 19.76 crore, of which, only 2.50 crore (7%) has been spent on liability of FY 2022-23. State was asked to make all the payments through eMarg only.

23. Quality

i) Lab has not been established in 52 packages. State was asked to establish labs in all the packages.

ii) 12 works have not been inspected by SQMs even once, out of which 11 are more than 12 months old. State was asked to carry out SQM inspection on these works.

iii) Total 2945 SQM inspections (1893 for regular PMGSY and 1052 for RCPLWEA) were targeted in the state during FY 2022-23, against which, only 777 SQM inspections (711 for regular PMGSY and 66 for RCPLWEA) have been conducted so far. ***Committee expressed displeasure over very few SQM inspections for RCPLWEA works. State was asked to increase the pace of SQM inspections, so as to achieve the annual target.***

iii) During NQM inspections conducted from August 2019 to July 2022, 12.69% completed works, 10.02% ongoing works, 33.64% maintenance works have been graded as unsatisfactory by NQMs. The unsatisfactory percentage is much above the national average. During NQM inspections conducted from August 2021 to July 2022 also, 15.89% completed works, 16.85% ongoing works, 35% maintenance works and 2% bridge works have been graded as unsatisfactory by NQMs. Unsatisfactory percentage reported by NQMs is alarming. State was asked to look into the quality aspect.

iv) During SQM inspections conducted from August 2019 to July 2022, 0.15% completed works, 0.43% ongoing works, 4% maintenance works have been graded as unsatisfactory by SQMs. ***There is huge difference between the unsatisfactory grading of NQM and SQM inspections. State was asked to look into the quality of SQM inspections. State representative mentioned that, they will conduct a meeting with SQMs in the upcoming week and requested that officials from NRIDA also attend the same.***

v) 104 ATRs of NQM inspections are pending from the state. State was asked to submit the ATRs at the earliest. ***ATRs pending for more than a year shall be marked as non-rectifiable.***

vi) Following anomalies have been observed in SQM inspections:-

- Condition of Main Information board, Citizen information board and logo boards are in a rusted condition, needs to be repainted. Package no. - JH1PG26N
- Camber has been checked in an absurd way, by keeping the rod in diagonal position from the center to the edge of the carriageway, thus the calculated elevation is totally wrong. Package no. - JH02RCPL-CHA-05

- Potholes and edge drops are visible on the surface of the carriageway. Still given satisfactory by the SQM. Package no. JH08TKE045

State was asked to ensure that all the engineers/ SQMs undergo the proficiency test. If any SQM fails to appear in the proficiency test, the state may de-empanel such SQM. Also SQMs need to be sensitized in order to avoid such anomalies. ATR of these anomalies should be submitted in compliance report.

ix) It was observed that, more no. of inspections is being carried out by SQMs who do not give much unsatisfactory grading. On the other hand, the SQMs who give much unsatisfactory grading are not being allotted the inspections. The allotment practice adopted by the state is not correct. *State was asked to take action against SQMs whose grading pattern appears to be outlier.*

23. Financial Issues

i) Interest verification certificate for FY 2004-05 to 2009-10 and FY 2020-21 has not been submitted by the state. State was asked to submit the same at the earliest.

iii) Interest recovery of Rs. 10.43 crore is pending from bank. State was asked to get the interest re-covered at the earliest. *State was asked to send the MoD, bank statement and reconciliation of last 2 years to NRIDA, so that the same can be parallel examined by NRIDA also.*

iv) State budget is not being reflected in 60:40 ratio in TSRY-07 report on PFMS. State was asked to get the issue resolved.

v) 143 works are pending for financial closure for more than 180 days as on 02-09-2022. State was asked to get these works financially closed at the earliest.

25. 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.
