

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

Room No.376

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi

Dated the 31st December, 2021

MINUTES

Subject: Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the Government of UT of Jammu and Kashmir for the year 2021-22 (Batch-I) – reg.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Minutes of the Pre-Empowered Committee meeting held on **9th December, 2021 at 3:45 PM (through VC)** under the Chairpersonship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA to discuss the project proposals of Government of UT of Jammu and Kashmir for the Batch-I (year 2021-22) of PMGSY-III.

2. UT is requested to furnish the compliance to the observations contained in the minutes to the Ministry/NRIDA at the earliest for conducting the EC Meeting on time.



Anjali Yadav

Assistant Director (RC)

Distribution:

1. The Chief Secretary, Government of UT of Jammu & Kashmir
2. The Principal Secretary, Public Works (R&B) Department, Government of Jammu & Kashmir.
3. The Chief Engineer, JKSRDA, Jammu & Kashmir.

Copy for information to:-

Sr. PPS to Secretary (RD)/ PPS to AS (RD)/ All Directors, NRIDA, New Delhi

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE
HELD ON 9TH DECEMBER, 2021 AT 3:45 PM TO CONSIDER PROJECT
PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF Jammu and Kashmir (UT)
UNDER PMGSY III, BATCH I, 2021-22**

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (RC) was held through Video Conference on **9th December, 2021 at 3:45 p.m.** under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA to consider the project proposals submitted by the UT of Jammu and Kashmir under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) (Batch-I) of 2021-22. Following officials were present in the meeting.

MoRD/ NRIDA Representatives	
Dr. Ashish Kumar Goel	Additional Secretary(RD), MoRD & 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 Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Dr. I.K.Pateriya	Director (P.II&III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agarwal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
UT Govt. Representatives	
Shri Shailendra Kumar	Principal Secretary PW(R&B) Department/ Empowered Officer JKRRDA
Ms. Tanvi Mir	Chief Engineer PMGSY, Kashmir.
Shri Ranjan Mengi	Chief Engineer PMGSY, Jammu.
Shri Mazhar Hussain Khan	Financial Controller.
Shri Ajay Kumar Raju	State Quality Coordinator
Shri Gopal Verma	Executive Engineer
Shri Sajad Ahmad Guru	IT Nodal Officer

2. Details of Proposal

Item	As per OMMAS dated 07.12.2021			
	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km (Lakhs)
Roads	235	1782.72	2462.71	138.14
LSBs	-	-	-	-
Total	235 roads + NIL LSBs	1782.72 km roads + 0.00 m LSBs	2462.71	

* Mord Share : Rs. 2188.25 Crore

UT Share: Rs

274.76 Crore

Target: 1750 Km
nil

Sanctioned:

3.75 m width road - 173 Nos & Length - 1108.406 km - Rs. 125.21 Lakhs/km

5.50 m width road - 58 Nos & Length - 621.04 km - Rs. 156.753 Lakhs/km

7.00 m width road - 04 No & Length - 53.27 km - Rs. 190.38 Lakhs/km

3. General Observations

- i) The Government of UT of Jammu & Kashmir has been allocated a road length of 1750 km under PMGSY-III.
- ii) The UT has submitted proposals for 235 roads of 1782.72 km. UT representative informed that **63 LSBs are to be proposed on these 235 roads, DPRs of which will be submitted later.**
- iii) Out of 235 roads, 173 roads of 1108.406 km have been proposed with 3.75 m carriageway width at an average cost of Rs. 125.21 lakh/ km, 58 roads of 621.04km have been proposed with carriageway width of 5.50 meter with an average cost of Rs. 156.73 lakh/ km and 04 roads of 53.27Km have been proposed with carriageway width of 7.00 m at an average cost of Rs. 190.38 lakh/ km.
- iv) All proposals have been uploaded and scrutinized by the STAs on OMMAS. However, PTA scrutiny of the proposals is yet to be carried out. UT representative informed that PTA scrutiny has been done and the report will be submitted in due course.
- v) UT has not submitted SLSC approval, MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats and consent letters of Hon'ble MPs on final proposal. These documents need to be provided at the earliest.
- vi) UT needs to certify that the roads proposed in current batch are not PMGSY roads which are under their design life.
- vii) 3rd party traffic verification for traffic considered more than 1 MSA should be done by the UT and the reports should be attached with the DPRs. **There are 11 such roads, where ATCC results should be included in the DPR.**
- viii) State should ensure that the design stage road safety audit has been done for all the proposed roads of length more than 5 km and the reports should be attached with the DPRs ensuring appropriate compliance to the recommendation made in the report.
- ix) Summary and photographs of transect walk have not been found attached to the DPRs. Same should be attached to the DPRs.
- x) The test results for GSB materials were not found to be attached in most of the DPRs. Same should be attached.

4. Planning Audit (Proposals)

i) Out of total 241 proposals on OMMAS, 229 proposals have been uploaded on Geo Sadak, 8 are pending at the level of SRRDA and 4 are pending at the level of PIU. UT was asked to upload all the proposals on Geo Sadak.

ii) Out of 41 sample proposals audited by NRIDA for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III, 14 proposals were flagged for examination/ justification from the UT. Some of the examples flagged in the audit are given below-

- a) One road in the Reasi district (**MRL02-Ganjote to Bhallar via Thral Shakaro**) has 94% non BT/CC surface. UT representative mentioned that the road will provide connectivity to approx. 17 habitations and these villagers will get access to nearby government offices and other facilities. Committee however clarified that objective of PMGSY-III is not to provide connectivity directly *per se*, to habitations as this was the objective of PMGSY-I. PMGSY-III objective is to **upgrade existing TR/MRL roads** to provide habitations better access to facilities like hospital, high schools and Gramin Agriculture market based on trace map and utility value. As such under PMGSY-III, existing roads which are through routes and major rural links will only get covered. A road having 94% kutcha road cannot be a major rural link by definition. A small portion of Kutcha road or a missing link can be taken if they form part of and Through rout and Major link.
- b) One road in Udhampur district (T07-Champari to kalori samani keri via Kalda talal) has 100% non BT/CC surface which shows that entire road is kutcha road. UT was asked to provide justification as to how this qualifies for PMGSY-III.
- c) A road in Kishtwar district (MRL01-Paddar road Dool to Buttpora) has 81% non BT/ CC surface and is also parallel to existing BT road. UT however mentioned that, the existing parallel BT road doesn't exist. It is being shown in google inadvertently due to hilly terrain and this has been cross checked physically.
- d) A road in Rajouri district (MRL04-Samote to Rangbagla) has 100% Non BT/CC surface.

iii) Committee further observed that, out of the total 235 proposals, 101 roads have 95-100% BT/ CC surface, 11 roads have 85-95% BT/CC surface, 13 roads have 75-85% BT/CC surface and 108 roads have less than 75% BT/CC surface. It was made clear that kutchha roads can not fall under the category of TR/ MRL and therefore prima facie not eligible for inclusion under PMGSY-III. UT needs to provide proper justification along with satellite map/ GeoSadak image for these 108 roads as to why these roads could be taken up in the light of PMGSY-III guidelines.

iv) UT was asked to provide road-wise justification for inclusion of the above mentioned roads and other such roads under PMGSY-III. **After discussion it was agreed upon to send a team from NRIDA to verify the proposal on the ground.**

v) It was observed that following roads with good PCI have been proposed for inclusion.

- a) T01-Pulwama Awantipora road in Awantipora block of Pulwama district with average cost of Rs. 212.38 lakh/ km
- b) T01-ODR 02 KM 2nd of MDR01 to RakhiShilvat Block Boundary Sumbal in Sumbal block of Bandipora district with average cost of Rs. 149.62 lakh/ km
- c) MRL04-PEHROO TO RANBIRPORA VIA RAMPORA in Khovripora block of Anantnag district with average cost of Rs. 162.95 lakh/ km

vi) UT representative informed that all these roads have been proposed for widening with 7 m width and that is why the cost is higher. UT clarified that they will bear the additional cost above 5.5 m width. **UT was asked to re-examine these roads as to why they need to be widened to 7m, and give justification based on traffic survey.**

5. Distribution of Roads based on traffic category

53 roads have been categorized as having traffic less than or equal to T5 and 160 roads have been proposed in traffic category T6 & T7. **Since 108 roads have less than 75% BT/CC surface, such large number of roads having this much traffic volume does not seem probable. UT needs to do the traffic survey afresh. There are 11 such roads (T9 and above), where ATCC results should be included in the DPR. The UT said that the survey was done during COVID-19, hence the traffic is less. The same seems to be contradictory to the obtained result.**

6. Average Cost Trends

The average cost of roads having 3.75 m carriageway width is Rs. 125.21 lakhs/km, those in 5.50 m carriageway width , average cost is Rs. 156.75 lakhs/ km and those in 7.00 m carriageway width , average cost is 190.38 lakhs/km which seem to be on higher side when compared with the cost of previous sanctions. UT mentioned that, for PMGSY-II, they had used 2013-14 SOR. Now they are using SOR of Jammu adopted in 2019-20. There has been a price escalation of around 25-30% in the rates of SOR of Jammu, 2019-20 as compared to 2013-14 SOR. **The same should be examined by NRIDA.**

7. Details of Non Pavement cost

i) The average cost/ km was observed to be very high as compared to other states of hilly terrain like Tamil Nadu, Kerala. UT was asked to re-look this. Most of the districts have high pavement and non-pavement cost, compared to the DPRs obtained elsewhere.

ii) The standard non pavement cost of roads in plain areas can be around Rs. 20-25 lakh/ km. It can go upto Rs. 30-40 lakh/ km for roads in hilly terrain, but in case of J&K, non pavement cost has gone upto Rs. 100 lakh/ km in 5.50 m carriageway width category roads like in Jammu, the non pavement cost is Rs. 120 lakh/ km. UT representative mentioned that Jammu is mostly hilly terrain, hence the higher cost. NRIDA mentioned that, along with other things, this aspect will also be looked into in the physical visit by the team of NRIDA.

8. Length-wise details of proposal

i) 64 Candidate Roads are of length 3 to 5 Km and 171 Candidate Roads are of length 5 Km or higher. All the candidate roads are said to be more than 5 km.

ii) It was observed that average candidate road length is 9.15 km and average proposed road length is 7.5 km.

9. Distribution of roads based on widening to various carriageway

i) It was observed that majority of the roads (162 in number) with 3 m width are proposed for widening to 3.75 m. NRIDA mentioned that if the UT is going to do equal widening on both sides, width will be 0.375 m and it will not be possible to excavate the trench and to do the rolling. UT mentioned that they will go for widening on one side only because widening on both the sides is not possible in hilly terrain. NRIDA mentioned that even in case of one side widening it will not be possible to do the rolling. For proper rolling, width of at least 1.8 m is required. NRIDA advised UT to examine, if 3-3.75 widening is at all required and if it is required, they should explain as to how will they do it. UT agreed to the point made by NRIDA and assured to re-examine the same.

10. PCU/ day details

i) It was observed that 114 roads in 3.75 m category and 11 roads in 5.5 m category are having PCU/ day less than 2000. Hence, there is inconsistency in adoption of carriageway width with respect to PCU data. UT was advised to retain the roads with 3 m width (provided they are TR/ MRL and otherwise eligible) rather than proposing them for widening to 3.75 m. UT agreed with the point made by the committee.

11. Pavement cost/ km wise details

i) It was observed that 132 roads in 3.75 m category have pavement cost between 50-91 lakh/km (Rs 50-60 Lakh/km -72 Nos, Rs 60-70 Lakh/km -40 Nos, Rs 70-80 Lakh/km -15 Nos, Rs 80-90 Lakh/km -4nos and more than 90 lakh/km-01 No). Nos. Similarly 58 roads in 5.5 m category have pavement cost between 50-131 lakh/km (Rs 50-60 Lakh/km -5 Nos, Rs 60-70 Lakh/km -16 Nos, Rs 70-80 Lakh/km -23 Nos, Rs 80-90 Lakh/km -7 and more than 90 lakh/km-7 No). 4 roads in 7.00 m category have pavement cost Rs. 60.25lakh/ km, Rs. 92.83lakh/ km, Rs. 102.76lakh/ km, Rs. 128.36 lakh/ km respectively. It appears higher pavement cost is because many proposals are of new construction, rather than upgradation. UT needs to look into it.

12. DPR Issues

i) The average cost/km is on the higher side when compared to previous batches.

- ii) The quantity of earthwork (cutting) seems to be on much higher side. UT informed that, earth cutting is being done in the cases where widening is involved. UT was asked to check again and road wise justification for the same should be submitted. There seems to be no need for widening based on PCU.
- iii) In maximum DPRs available existing crust thickness detail has not been attached. These are up-gradation proposal and to know the existing pavement layers' thickness pit test must be conducted.
- iv) In some of DPRs, the CBR of the existing crust is less than 5%, therefore as per IRC SP:72 2015 the existing crust should be stabilized to achieve a minimum design CBR of 5% in order to use the design catalogue.
- v) For most of the roads, UT has provisioned BM & OGPC. Committee mentioned that, BM can be allowed in declared frost affected blocks only, for other blocks, it should be deleted. UT mentioned that, out of 20 districts, 18 districts get snow and rain is almost 1000 mm / year. Combination of snow and rain forces them to opt for BM & CC. Most of the blocks are either in heavy snow zone or rain zone. UT was further clarified that they can go for BM only in the blocks which have been **declared as frost affected**.
- vi) In some of DPRs cement concrete pavement, 200 mm GSB, 150 mm WBM Gr III and 100 mm M10 Concrete over which 200 mm thick M30 grade concrete has been proposed, UT was advised to follow para 3.6.2 of IRC:SP:62:2014 for sub-base and base layer thickness. UT informed that it has been done that way only except for one block in Kashmir. NRIDA further mentioned that, if proposed CC pavement is on existing flexible pavement, instead of conventional method of 200 mm thickness, Cell filled concrete/ panelled cement concrete/ white topping should be proposed to economise the cost of construction.
- vii) Widening of CDs proposed in many of the DPRs and cost of widening is almost equal to new construction cost. UT needs to explore possibility of widening on one side in order to save the cost of one side wall and wing wall/ return wall/ approach wall.
- viii) The quantity of steel proposed for the construction of slab culvert is on higher side. UT was asked to look into it and follow IRC:SP:20.
- ix) Existing/proposed slab culverts portion needs to be deducted in pavement quantity to avoid duplication of quantities

x) The cost towards protection work is on the higher side as the proposed works are existing BT and protection works are already available. This needs to be re-verified and should be justified as per the actual site condition. UT was asked to explore the use of new technology so as to attain cost economy.

xi) UT has proposed pucca side drain which is on the higher side. The Pucca drain should be provided as per actual site requirement. The location and size of drain proposed needs to be mentioned in the DPR. Also, drainage plan should be attached. Further NRIDA advised UT to go for shallow drain with stone packing instead of pucca drain so as to reduce the cost. UT requested NRIDA to hold VC with all the PIUs on this account.

xii) In maximum DPRs, UT has proposed the RCC slab culverts. As per the photographs the existing culverts are in good condition except at some locations. Good condition CDs should be retained by doing repair work and widening can be done if required, rather than replacement. This needs to be re-verified and should be justified as per the actual site condition.

xiii) In maximum DPRs, UT has proposed the gravel shoulders on both sides for a width of 1.2 to 1.6 m with thickness more than 150 mm. As per IRC SP: 72:2015 para 9.2 gravel shoulders should be restricted to 1m width on both sides for 100mm thickness. UT was advised to refer to the Hill Road manual to know the kind of shoulder to be provided in hilly areas. Keeping in view of the PCU, are hard shoulders actually required? This should be examined.

xiv) Crash barrier has been proposed invariably in many of the DPRs and the cost is on the higher side. It should be done as per the road safety documentation. The clear colour photographs of that particular location should be attached to justify the same.

xv) 7 m carriageway width road has been proposed in some of the roads. It was made clear to the UT that the additional cost beyond 5.50 m should be calculated separately and uploaded on OMMAS under higher specification cost which is to be borne by the UT. Even then, it should be justified on the basis of traffic.

13. Maintenance

UT has proposed 6th year Renewal cost of Rs. 267.89 crore which is 10.88 % of construction cost. The same should ideally be more than 18% of the construction cost.

14. R&D Proposals

UT has not proposed any road for construction using new technologies. UT of J&K has to take action for adoption of new technologies.

15. Progress of PMGSY works

i) Under PMGSY-I, one road of 8 km is still being shown as unawarded. UT was asked to check the status of this road and it should be dropped if still unawarded. NRIDA was asked to send the name of the road to UT.

ii) Annual physical target allocated to the UT is 4841 km, against which, 1526 km has only been constructed. UT mentioned that they may not be able to complete more than 3300 km, citing reasons like tree falling etc. UT was asked to submit the work-wise constraints and plan of action, so that the target can be worked out.

16. eMarg/ Geo-informatics

i) 634 roads are under DLP and maintenance liability during 2021-22 is Rs. 22.6 crore, against which the expenditure is only Rs. 1.3 crore. Routine Inspection has been missed in 61% of works in the month of November, 2021. UT needs to monitor the e-Marg implementation seriously. On the request of UT, it was decided that NRIDA will hold a webinar on eMarg with the UT. The UT should complete saturation on eMarg before the EC meeting.

ii) 228 replies are pending on geo-informatics for length error, 109 for habitation error, 80 for length and habitation error and 614 for missing roads. UT needs to look into it and submit the replies at the earliest.

17. Maintenance of roads under DLP

UT has not yet informed UT's updated data related to DLP expenditure and renewal length. UT was asked to send the updated data at the earliest and update OMMAS before the EC meeting.

18. Quality

- i. Out of 1030 packages, labs have not been established in 23 packages. UT needs to look into it.
- ii. Pace of SQM inspections is quite slow. UT needs to pay attention to it.
- iii. 89 works have not been inspected by SQMs even once. Out of these 89 works, payment of more than Rs. 10 lakh on 26 works has already been done. UT needs to look into it as to why the works are not getting inspected by SQMs.
- iv. In the last three years (November 2018- November 2021), 33.33% maintenance works, 5.75 % completed works and 5.31% ongoing works have been graded as unsatisfactory in NQM inspections. In the last one year (November 2020- November 2021), 26.67 % maintenance works, 0% completed works and 4.21% ongoing works have been graded as unsatisfactory in NQM inspections. It could be seen that, unsatisfactory percentage has slightly reduced in ongoing works and maintenance works. UT needs to improve on maintenance of works.
- v. 14 ATRs of NQM inspections are pending from the state.
- vi. Target for SQM inspection during 2021-22 is 4573 out of which 1107 have been conducted so far. UT needs to increase the pace of inspections.

19. Anomalies of SQM Inspections

- i) Some sieves are missing for gradation of WMM in photographs but graded as satisfactory. (Package Number :- JK03141, JK14595).

- ii) Completed road given satisfactory but no photograph is uploaded in respect of gradation, thickness, test pit etc. No proof of inspection conducted at site. (Package Number :- JK14438).
- iii) No description given in photographs (Package Number:- JK02101, JK02139).
- iv) Volumetric analysis conducted using tin box (Package Number:- JK05185, JK10192)

UT needs to sensitize SQMs to reduce such anomalies.

20. Financial issues

- i) Audited Balance Sheet of Administrative Expenses and Maintenance funds has not been submitted by the UT. Same should be submitted at the earliest.
- ii) PMGSY financial reconciliation report has not been submitted by the UT completely. UT should expedite the process and submit the report.
- iii) Bank interest verification reports for F.Y 2010-11 to 2016-17 has not been submitted. The Same should be submitted at the earliest.
- iv) Interest of Rs. 0.62 Cr. is pending recovery from Bank. UT was asked to coordinate with the bank and get the interest recovery credited.
- v) 32 works are pending for financial closure for more than 180 days as on 08-12-2021. UT needs to take immediate action.
- vi) Central share of Rs. 265.02 crore is pending with the UT treasury. UT should get it credited to the nodal account at the earliest.

The UT 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.
