

File No.P-17024/14/2019-RC (FMS-369039)

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

Room No.376
Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 14th December, 2021

MINUTES

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

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on **26th November, 2021 at 3:00 PM (through VC)** under the Chairpersonship of Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the State Government of Madhya Pradesh for the year 2021-22 (Batch-I).

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



(Anjali Yadav)
Assistant Director (RC)

Distribution:

1. Shri Umakant Umrao, Principal Secretary, Panchayat & Rural Development Department, Govt. of Madhya Pradesh Email: psprd@mp.gov.in
2. Ms. Tanvi Sundriyal, CEO, M.P. Rural Road Development Authority Block-2 Floor-5, Parayawas Bhawan Bhopal Email: ceomprda@gmail.com.
3. Shri P.K Nigam, E-in-C, M.P. Rural Road Development Authority Block-2 Floor-5, Parayawas Bhawan Bhopal Email: cgm2mprda@rediffmail.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 Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee held on 26 November, 2021 for the proposals of the State of Madhya Pradesh under PMGSY-III, Batch-I (2021-22)

A meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee for PMGSY was held on 26.11.2021 at 12:00 Noon through VC under the Chairpersonship of JS(RC)& DG (NRIDA) to discuss the proposals under PMGSY-III, Batch-I, 2021-22. The following officials were present in the meeting:-

MoRD/ NRIDA representatives	
Shri. Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary (RC) & DG (NRIDA)
Shri K. M. Singh	Deputy Secretary (RC)
Ms. Anjali Yadav	Assistant Director (RC)
Shri B.C. Pradhan	Consultant Director (Technical), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Dr. I.K. Pateriya	Director (P-II & P-III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agarwal	Director (P-I), NRIDA
State Government representatives	
Ms. Tanvi Sundriyal	CEO, MPRRDA
Shri P.K. Nigam	Eng.-in-Chief, MPRRDA
Shri MPS Niranjana	CGM, Finance, MPRRDA
Shri KC Dhruv Kar	CGM, MPRRDA
Shri SD Pendse	GM, MPRRDA
Shri Govind Pancholi	ITNO, MP

2. Details of Current Proposal

As per States proposal dated 12.11.2021					As per OMMAS as on 25.11.2021			
Item	Nos	Length (in km/ m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/ km (Lakhs)	Nos	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/ km (Lakhs)
Roads	93	984.56	648.20	65.83	93	984.56	648.20	65.83
LSBs	255	8,329.61	305.26	3.66/m	256	8,403.73	305.88	3.64/m
Total	93 roads 255 LSBs	984.56 m roads 8,329.61 m LSBs	953.46		93 roads 256 LSBs	984.56 km roads 8,403.73 m LSBs	954.09*	

*MoRD Share : Rs. 553.22 Crores

State Share : Rs. 400.87 Crores

3. General Observations

- The State of Madhya Pradesh has been allocated a target of 12,362.50 km under PMGSY-III, against which 11,390.562 km has already been sanctioned to the state.

ii. Current batch of proposal is for 93 roads of 984.56 km and 256 LSBs of 8,403.73 m at a cost of Rs. 954.09 crore (MoRD Share: Rs. 553.22 crore & State share: Rs. 400.87 crore)

iii. 18 roads of 224.54 km are proposed for 5.5 m carriageway width at an average cost of Rs. 78.03 lakhs/Km and 75 roads of 760.02 km are proposed for 3.75 m carriageway width at an average cost of Rs 62.23 lakhs/km.

iv. All proposals have been scrutinized on OMMAS by STA. However, PTA has scrutinized only 13 roads and 10 LSBs on OMMAS. Scrutiny of 16 more LSBs needs to be done by PTA. State assured that PTA scrutiny of these 16 LSBs will be done in before EC. The observations by PTA should be complied in all the DPRs.

v. It was observed that the State has proposed 12.56 km more than their allocation. The same needs to be reduced to the balance length eligible under final batch of proposals. State requested to consider these roads as they are unable to drop this small road. To this, NRIDA mentioned that, there are some ineligible roads that have been identified in the DPRs which will have to be dropped and this additional length will be adjusted.

vi. 40 LSBs have been proposed on roads proposed in the current batch. However, 216 LSBs have been proposed on roads sanctioned in previous batches of PMGSY-III.

4. Average Cost Trends (Roads)

From the average cost trends, it could be seen that in 2019-20, average cost was Rs. 69.6 lakh/ km for 3.75 m width category and Rs. 81.5 lakh/ km for 5.5 m width category. It was Rs. 56.63 lakh/ km for 3.75 m and Rs. 74.76 lakh/km for 5.5 m in 2020-21. It was Rs. 57.44 lakh/ km for 3.75 m and Rs. 77.19 lakh/ km for 5.5 m in 2021-22 (Batch-I). In the current batch of proposal, the average cost is Rs. 62.63 lakh/ km for 3.75 m and Rs. 78.03 lakh/ km for 5.5 m. *The average cost has gone up from the previous batches. This needs explanation.*

5. Average Cost Trends (Bridges)

There is not much increase in the average cost of bridges in comparison to the previous batch. However, NRIDA mentioned that MP has proposed very small span of 8 to 10 m even if total span is more than 30 m or even 60 m. It was advised that the state can go for higher span of 20 to 25 m by adopting RCC girder bridges instead of small span solid slab bridges. If required they can adopt deeper foundation for higher span arrangement so as to avoid the issue of scouring. This was earlier discussed by the State. Since there have been cases of washing out of bridges in MP, in PMGSY and other departments as well, state was advised to explore these suggestions of NRIDA. State mentioned that list of 4 such bridges have been identified in this regard. State assured to revisit the same. *The justification for span and choice of design for each bridge should be prepared and vetted by STA/ PTA/ NRIDA.*

6. Trace Map Cut (Quality of Roads)

Min. Trace Map Rank	Numbers of Proposals	%
1 to 15	52	56%
16 to 50	30	32%
51 to 100	10	11%
> 100	1	1%
Total	93	

It was observed that the State needs to re-examine the 11 roads meticulously which have trace map rank more than 50.

7. Planning Audit (Proposals)

i. All the 93 sample proposals have been audited by NRIDA for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III & some proposals were flagged for justification/ modification. State has sent the compliance of the same. However, justification for 14 proposals including 3 proposals rejected in the previous batches as to how they meet PMGSY-III guidelines has not yet been provided by the state. State was asked to send the same.

ii. The following roads were observed by the pre-EC where percentage of non-BT/CC road is more than 50%, hence not meeting the PMGSY-III criteria: -

- One road of Barwani district (MRL09-Anjrada to Topkala Road, 3.75 m) was found to be 100% non BT/CC, which shows that entire road is a kutchra road and is benefiting a small population. This needs to be deleted.
- One road of Khandwa district (MRL04-SH-41 (Mathela) to Sudamapuri to Atul Bhikari road, 3.75 m) was found to be 100% non BT/CC, which shows that entire road is a kutchra road and is a parallel alignment, which means that a route already exists. This needs to be deleted.
- One road from Dhar district (MRL03- Amlafata to dholahanuman) is different from the alignment of candidate road.

State was asked to re-visit the above roads and other such roads and substitute these with some other eligible roads within the target allotted.

iii. A road in Chhatrapur district (T03-NH-86 Sadwa to Badamalhra Ghuwara RD Via Dhanguwan Gorakhpura) was found to have its 100% length as non BT/CC, which shows that the entire road is a kutchra road. However, the proposed length of 8.65 km is part of larger candidate road of 19.92 km and the proposed length is a missing link. The proposed length is supposed to connect the habitations to National Highway. Proper justification as to which facilities/ habitation (population) are being benefitted should be given.

8. List of flagged proposals for further justifications/ modifications

The following roads were flagged during the pre-EC for which the state needs to provide justifications:-

Sr.N	District Na	Block nam	WORK NAME
------	-------------	-----------	-----------

o.	me	e	
1	Barwani	Pati	MRL09-Anjrada to Topkala Road
2	Chhatarpur	Bijawar	MRL04-SH-10 Kishangarh Amangaj Road to Jata Shankar Shahgarh Marg via Kupi Bi la chouptra
3	Chhatarpur	Laundi	MRL06-Laundi Mahoba Road to Aktonha Via Pratappura
4	Chhatarpur	Nowgong	MRL04-Mausahaniya To NH-75 Via Tudar Tidni
5	Chhatarpur	Rajnagar	MRL09-NH75 to Didoniya to Katara to Pipariya
6	Chhatarpur	Rajnagar	MRL16-Dhawad to Ranehfall road via Akona
7	Dhar	Tirla	MRL03-Amlafata to dholahanuman
8	Hoshangabad	Pipariya	T04-Pachlawara to Sarrakishor
9	Hoshangabad	Seoni Malwa	MRL07-SH 15 Babadiya Bhau Faridpur Amlada Guranjghat
10	Khandwa	Khandwa	MRL04-SH-41 (Mathela) to Sudamapuri to Atut Bhikari Road
11	Raisen	Sanchi	T06-Raisen-Chiklod Road to Mahuakheda- Naktara Sultanpur Road
12	Rewa	Sirmour	MRL06-BHAMARA TO KHAMHARIYA CHAUBAN
13	Sehore	Budni	MRL12-Budni Rehti road to Khandabad, Yar Nagar
14	Umaria	Manpur	MRL28-Sohagpur Manpur Rd. to Bhamraha

9. Proposal Checks

It was observed that in 8 proposals, existing CC road is being upgraded with new CC overlay without any widening. Also, the existing CC length of these roads is greater than the proposed CC length with average CC cost per km greater than Rs. 40 lakh/ km. State was asked to confirm if these roads are out of DLP. In that case, state may propose these roads under new technology like paneled cement concrete/ RCCP/ Cell filled concrete to attain cost economy.

10. Existing Surface

It was observed that, 36 roads have BT/CC in 0-85% of their length. State was asked to check these 36 roads individually, so as to ascertain that these are actually Through routes/ Major Rural Link routes and eligible to be included in PMGSY-III. NRIDA will also scrutinize the same on Geo Sadak.

11. High Priority roads skipped in CUCPL

- i. It was observed that, 33 roads have been skipped in CUCPL citing the reason that the state is not interested in riding surface improvement. On this, state was asked to check the PCI of these roads.
- ii. 49 roads have been skipped citing the reason that ownership of the roads is with different department. State was advised to visit these 49 roads and see the present status. If these roads are eligible for upgradation under PMGSY-III and are not being upgraded by the respective owner department, then the roads should be taken up under PMGSY-III. Roads cannot be skipped just on ownership issue. Proof should be provided if they are being upgraded by respective departments.

12. Proposals with good existing surfaces

It was observed that the 2 roads (MRL 67 of Chhindwara district and T01 of Khandwa district) with good existing surface are proposed for upgradation. However, proposals with majority surface in good condition (PCI>3) are not eligible under PMGSY-III. State was asked to either drop such roads or give road wise justification with cost economy and geo-tagged videos. State was advised to verify the DPRs at SRRDA level and make the necessary corrections.

13. Distribution of roads based on Traffic category

- i. State needs to submit the report of ATCC axle road survey done on T9 and >2 MSA category roads. State assured to send the same before EC meeting.
- ii. State was further asked to provision surface dressing for 100% length of T4 & T5 category roads (except CC). NRIDA mentioned that out of 32.21 km under this category, state has proposed around 23 km with surface dressing, rest with cc pavement. State should propose atleast 50% of the roads under T6, T7, T8 category with surface dressing. **It was observed that Madhya Pradesh has not yet adopted surface dressing while other states have already adopted. Director (Technical) was asked to hold a webinar with the state and sensitize them with the technology.**

14. Pavement cost/ km wise details

It was observed that out of 75 roads, 12 roads in 3.75 m width category roads have pavement cost more than Rs. 50 lakh/ km and out of 18 roads, 8 roads in 5.5 m width category roads have pavement cost more than Rs. 65 lakh/ km. Although there are not many outliers, it was desired that state should use new technologies like cement stabilization etc. to reduce the cost.

15. Non-Pavement cost/ km wise details

It was observed that out of 75 roads in 3.75 m width category, 40 roads have non-pavement cost/ km greater than Rs. 15 lakh/ km. These 40 roads should be proposed under new technology. Further, non-pavement cost of a road in Panna district has been found to be Rs. 80 lakh/ km which seems very large. The same needs to be re-examined. **It was decided that such roads will be visited by a team from NRIDA.**

16. PCU/ day details

It was observed that out of 75 roads in 3.75 m width category, 12 roads have PCU/ day more than than 2000. State was asked to re-check the same as these roads are eligible for 5.5 m width category.

17. Distribution of roads based on widening to various carriageway

Total 6 roads are proposed for 3 to 3.75 m widening. State was asked as to how will they construct it and have they provisioned for escalation of 1.2 m width from the edge of either side of the road. State was further advised to check the PCU of these roads and if traffic volume is found to be low then these can be taken for upgradation of only 3 m width, as the same will result into better & stronger roads.

18. Details of current batch of proposals

The following districts were identified as outliers in terms of total cost per Km:-

- i. Alirajpur
- ii. Barwani
- iii. Panna
- iv. Raisen
- v. Sehore
- vi. Ujjain

State was asked to give road-wise justification. A team of NRIDA will also visit these districts to know the reasons of such increase in total cost/ km.

19. DPR Issues

1. State needs to provide MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats duly signed by PIUs and consent letters of Hon'ble MPs on final proposal.

2. Proper transect walk photographs, transect walk summary/ Minutes, and copy of Gramma Sabha's approval are not attached to most of the DPRs. State was asked to attach the same in the DPRs.
3. State should certify that the roads proposed in current batch are not PMGSY roads which are under design life.
4. State needs to ensure that the 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. Further, State should ensure that the existing CDs are widened to 9 m width for 5.50 m width roads.
5. Reports of 3rd party traffic verification as per recent advisory by adopting ATCC along with axle load survey for traffic considered more than 1 MSA should be attached with the DPRs.
6. 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.
7. State may propose roads with FDR technology where the average pavement cost/km is on the higher side.
8. State should ensure that due credit has been given for existing pavement and overlay thickness proposed in the DPRs as per clause 2.2.3 of IRC: SP:72:2015.
9. In some DPRs, 2 layers of tack coat is proposed. One-layer tack coat needs to be deleted as per D.O. letter No. NRRDA-P014(11)/1/2018-JD (Tech) Dated- 23-03- 2018.
10. Existing/ proposed box culverts, slab culverts, Causeways, bridge portion needs to be deducted in pavement quantity to avoid duplication of quantities.
11. State has designed proposal of 14 roads with IRC 37. For proposals with traffic considered above 5 MSA, State should ensure design crust requirements over and above traffic 5 MSA should be borne by State Government under higher specifications. State mentioned that only two roads are above 5 MSA. To this, state was informed that the additional cost is to be borne by the state government. Further, **state was advised to use FDR technology for these roads.**
12. Instead of only RCC protection work, state may explore other technologies such as RR Masonry, Gabion wall etc. in order to achieve economy.
13. Provision for road safety should only as per the recommendation of RSA. It needs to rationalize as per site requirement such as sharp curve etc. and also the road safety guideline issued by NRIDA needs to be referred and response from the PIU should also be filled in the RSA report.
14. Cost relating to shifting of electric poles & telephone poles, land acquisition etc. are to be considered under the higher specification cost.
15. State has proposed smaller spans i.e. 6 to 10 m. State may propose RCC T beam slab type structures with longer spans in the range of 18 to 20 m or so depending upon the site requirements and

considering the economic point of view (MP- 11- BR- 348, MP- 23- BR- 303, MP- 28- BR- 305 & MP- 22- BR- 315).

16. Proper geo-technical investigation details need to be attached with the LSB DPRs (MP- 16- BR- 306 & MP- 16- BR- 310)

17. Joint Inspection reports of bridge site needs to be provided by the State.

20. R&D Proposals

i. It was observed that state has not proposed enough roads under new technology. Moreover, state was asked to propose all the CC pavement roads under new technology.

ii. State was asked to increase the no. of roads under cement stabilization, lime stabilization, soil stabilization under mainstreaming or nano technology. It will lead to reduction in cost.

iii. Length proposed for construction using waste plastics is not adequate. State was asked to use waste plastics for maximum number of roads.

iv. Surface dressing should be used for all roads upto T5 traffic volume category and for atleast 50% length for T6-T8 category roads.

21. Other Issues

1. Committee observed that state has 256 bridges pending for construction. Against this no. they do not have adequate no. of bridge experts. State was asked to empanel the adequate no. of bridge experts who can supervise the construction of bridges at site.

2. It was observed that, pace of SQM inspections is very slow. State needs to increase the number of SQM inspections.

3. State was asked to send the proposal for age relaxation in respect of empanelment of SQMs.

4. QC labs have not been established in respect of 170 packages. State needs to look into it.

5. It was observed that 11 no. of works have not been inspected by SQMs even once. State needs to look into it.

6. CBI complaint of Shri Surendra Agrawal alleging that the contractors have been issued completion certificate before completion of the project under PMGSY Scheme to enable them to apply for fresh contract is pending with the Division for quite some time. State has been asked to send the ATR through letters and reminders. However, the same has not been received yet. State was asked to expedite the submission of ATR for its further transmission to Vigilance section.

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.
