

No.P-17024/20/2020-RC (FMS No. 371918)


Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development

KrishiBhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 3rd March, 2021

Minutes

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

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Pre- Empowered Committee held on 22nd February, 2021 through Video Conferencing to consider the project proposals for Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III)for the year 2021-21 (Batch-II) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action.


(Devinder Kumar)
Director (RC)

Distribution:

- (i) The Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Odisha, Bhubaneshwar-751001.
- (ii) The Chief Executive Officer, Odisha Rural Roads Development Agency, Bhubaneshwar.
- (iii) The Chief Engineer, Odisha Rural Roads Development Agency, Bhubaneshwar.
- (iv) All Directors in NRIDA.

Copy to:-

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

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 22nd FEBRUARY, 2021 TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS OF PMGSY-III SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF ODISHA UNDER PMGSY-III (BATCH-II, 2020-21)

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee was held through video conference on 22nd February, 2021 at 12:00 Noon under the chairmanship of Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Odisha under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III). Following officials were present in the meeting:

Dr Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary, (RC) & DG, NRIDA
Shri Devinder Kumar	Director (RC), MoRD
Shri. B C Pradhan	Consultant (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Aggarwal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Dr. I.K.Pateriya	Director (P.II&III), NRIDA
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri Sudarshan Parida	CEO, Odisha SRRDA
Shri C.M. Pattanaik	Chief Engineer, Odisha SRRDA
Shri Sudhir Tripaty	SQC, Odisha SRRDA
Shri A.K.Mishra	ITNO, Odisha SRRDA

2. Details of Proposal:

Item	As per OMMAS dated 21.02.2021			
	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)
Roads	557	3,477.21	2,047.37	58.88
LSBs	39	2,360.57	149.74	6.34
Total	557 roads 39 LSBs	3,477.21 km roads 2,360.57 m LSBs	2,197.11*	
*MoRD Share : Rs. 1,207.69 Crore Target : 9,400 km		State share : Rs. 989.42 Crore Sanctioned : 3,327.50 km		

- (i) 3.75 m width road- 424 Nos & Length – 2,547 km - Rs. 51.61 Lakhs/km
5.50 m width road- 133 Nos & Length- 930.26 km – Rs. 78.77 Lakhs/km

(ii) All proposals scrutinized by STAs. PTA has not scrutinized any proposals on OMMAS. **The PTA scrutiny should be ensured before EC.** State has proposed, RQI length of 875.05 km which needs to be verified and corrected. State to do the needful.

(iii) State has proposed Rs.4.14 lakhs/km for 3.75 m width roads and Rs. 8.22 Lakhs/km for 5.50 m width roads under higher specification (to be borne by the state. Over all contribution towards higher specification is 5.23 Lakhs/km. Hence over all construction cost is Rs 53.65 Lakhs/km. This higher specification is for the land acquisition. State

should exclude the cost of land from DPRs as it creates accounting problem in central share viz-a-viz state share. After excluding cost of higher specification, state should enter overall construction cost per Km on OMMAS.

(iv) The State Government of Odisha has been allocated a road length 9,400 km under PMGSY-III. The first batch of proposals of 494 roads of 3,327.50 km and 4 Bridges of 174.84 m have been sanctioned to the State for Rs 1,996.23 crore (Central Share Rs 1,097.52 crore and State Share Rs 898.71 crore). The State has now submitted proposals for 557 roads of length 3477.21 m and 39 LSBs of length 2360.57 m. Out of 557 roads, 424 roads of 2,547 km road length has been proposed with 3.75 m carriageway width and 133 roads of 930.26 km road length has been proposed with carriageway width of 5.50 m.

Traffic wise details of road

- (i) In 3.75 m carriageway width, 217 roads of length 132.77 km are in T5 category with average cost Rs 52.75 lakhs/km (average pavement cost Rs. 35.18 lakh/Km). How these roads are MLR/TR, should be justified.
- (ii) In 3.75 m carriageway width, 206 roads of length 1211.80 km are in T6&T7 category with average cost Rs 50.34 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs.34.84 lakh/Km).
- (iii) In 5.50 m carriageway width, 05 roads of length 30.35 km are in T6&T7 category with average cost Rs 76.28 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 63.53 lakh/Km).
- (iv) In 3.75 m carriageway width, 01 road of length 12.40 km is in T8 category with average cost Rs 54.76 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 42.74 lakh/Km).
- (v) In 5.50 m carriageway width, 02 roads of length 17.20 km are in T8 category with average cost Rs 63.55 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 52.33 lakh/Km).
- (vi) In 5.50 m carriageway width, 126 roads of length 882.69 km are in T9 category with average cost Rs 79.15 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 60.38 lakh/Km).
- (vii) It should be clarified whether all these 5.5 m roads mentioned above are for widening or are existing 5.5 m. If they are proposed for widening, then what is the PCU as per traffic survey.

The length-wise proposal

(i) Out of 557 roads, 1 road is 2 to 3 Km in length with average cost Rs 35.01 lakhs/Km, 184 roads are 3 to 5 Km in length with average cost Rs 58.20 lakhs/Km and 372 roads are more than 5 Km in length with average cost Rs 59.08 lakhs/Km. State should confirm whether these roads which are less than 5 Km in length are part of longer candidate road which are MLR/TR. Also examine their UV and justify its inclusion in proposal, though the State has intimated that average length of candidate road is 9.47 Km.

(ii) Out of the total proposal of 3477.21 Km of roads, 5.91 km is brick soling, 157.81 km is from track level, 1109.06 km from Gravel level, 23.05 km from WBM level, 1506.98 km are BT & 674.40 Km are CC roads. State should justify high quantity of track/gravel and how they can be classified as MLR/TR. NRIDA to detail team to Odisha and examine how these roads qualify for PMGSY-III. Detailed examination on satellite map/GIS should be done along with traffic survey data.

(iv) Average cost of road in few districts like Kendrapara, Mayurbhanj, Bhadrak, Ganjam, Khurda, Puri, Sonepuri is higher as compared to other districts and previous sanctions. State is requested to examine this high cost.

3. Trace Map Quality

Min. Trace Map Rank	Numbers of Proposals	%
1 to 15	429	73%
16 to 50	130	22%
51 to 100	23	4%
> 100	3	1 %
Total	586	

More than 95% of roads have been proposed from higher trace map rank. *Reasons for selecting 26 roads with low trace map rank road-wise, alignment map of all these 26 roads and its UV with detailed justification are required from the State. NRIDA should scrutinize all these roads of low trace map ranks through GEOSADAK.*

4. Planning

- (i) Planning audit of Candidate Road and mapping of benefitted habitations completed before PRE-EC. Because of high sample reject, SRRDA re-verified mapping in all Blocks. Current proposals are based on newly generated CUCPL. Some blocks may still have incorrect mapping of benefitted habitations and the State should relook into it
- (ii) In districts Balangir, Ganjam, Malkangiri, blocks Deogaon, Digapahandi, Hinglicut, Kudumuluguma have unsatisfactory CUCPL as per the guidelines i.e. some TR/MRLs have over-mapped and some have under-mapped benefitted habitations leading to misleading utility values and then CUCPL.
- (iii) State needs to re verify mapping, rectify and regenerate CUCPL. DPR should be put on hold, as the entire list may subject to change.
- (iv) Sample of **284** proposals was identified by NRIDA and audited for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III. Out of 284, 107 found Ok, 35 need correction and 142 are pending for checking. The result of this checking will also be communicated to the state soon for rectification of all the proposals accordingly.

5. Proposal Level Checks

- (i) 45 proposals have more than 20% variation in eligible length and proposed length (proposed > eligible). State should ensure that non-eligible (PCI > 3) length should not be proposed.
- (ii) 17 proposals with Pucca drain length more than twice the length of CC length and Pucca drain is > 500. These proposals are OR05424 OR21906 OR04320 OR21953 OR18215 OR21952 OR21910 OR04330 OR04332 OR05393 OR04329 OR11533 OR05385 OR20486 OR05430 OR11544 OR11426. The state should submit satellite maps of these proposals stating the exact position of the drains with justification.
- (iii) 30 proposals have majority of their surface between PCI 2-3 but the cost/km is above 80 lakhs/km. State should assess and submit ATR whether these proposals are suited for RQI instead of upgradation and submit detailed ATR road-wise.

6. DPR Issues

- (i) State should provide a copy of SLSC approval, MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats and consent letters of Hon'ble MPs on final proposal as per latest advisory issued by MoRD on 02 Jun 2020. This action should be accomplished now so as to save time in sanction of these proposals. State should certify that the roads proposed in current batch are not PMGSY roads which are under design life.
- (ii) State needs to provide compliance to the conditions imposed in previous batch clearance letter (Batch I of 2020-21).
- (iii) 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.
- (iv) 3rd party traffic verification as per recent advisory should be done by the State for design traffic considered more than 1 MSA and the reports should be attached with the DPRs. Sample reports need to be provided for verification.
- (v) State should ensure that the design stage RSA has been done for all the proposed candidate roads and the reports should be attached with the DPRs. Sample reports need to be provided for verification.
- (vi) State should propose surface dressing where the roads designed with T5 and below traffic category as per design chart and Clause 7.3.3 of IRC: SP:72:2015.
- (vii) State should provide PCU/day details of the roads proposed with 5.5 m carriageway width.
- (viii) 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.
- (ix) State has proposed 773.84 km (22.25%) using CC pavement. Out of this 664 km is existing CC pavement. Majority of these roads may be proposed with Panelled Cement Concrete/ Cell Filled Concrete/ white topping. **State should carry out the condition survey of existing CC pavements for proper assessment of quantum of work required. Is entire existing 664 Km of CC pavement is going to be demolished and what is the credit expected. State should justify the requirement of 773.84 Km of CC pavement, in terms of existing pavement's design life, and requirement of its strengthening, if any, on the basis of traffic (PCU and Load).**
- (x) Earthwork cost is on the higher side in some roads (More than Rs. 10 lakhs/km). Needs to be rationalised.
- (xi) Pavement cost/km is on the higher side (>Rs 50 lakhs/km) in the packages OR16312, OR16330, OR16361, OR21982, OR23309, OR26352 & OR27532 (3.75 m width roads).
- (xii) Pavement cost/km is on the higher side (>Rs 80 lakhs/km) in the packages OR16322, OR16338, OR16320, OR18226, OR18203 & OR21971 (5.5 m width roads).
- (xiii) Pavement cost/km is < Rs 7 Lakhs/km in the package no. OR16362, OR23287 (3.75 m width roads).
- (xiv) State should provide the rate analysis with comparison of cost between conventional method and roads using new technologies and some of the DPRs using these technologies including rate analysis needs to be scrutinised at NRIDA.

7. Governance issues at SRRDA

- a. State Government should furnish inputs on following points pertaining to Governance issues at SRRDA/ PIUs: -
 - (ii) Governance related issues like staff strength at SRRDA and PIU level. Whether sufficient staff is available at SRRDA & PIUs corresponding to balance and anticipated work at hand, including roads under maintenance. 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 ameliorate them should also be spelt out.

- (iii) Strength of technical wing involved in preparation and scrutiny of DPRs. Whether sufficient manpower and expertise exists?
- (iv) Capability for design and execution of bridge works and their supervision during construction.
- (v) Mechanism of SQM inspections and availability of dedicated 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. How many staff have been deployed at SRRDA for support of SQC, to analyse the reports of NQMs & SQMs? How effective is the Quality Cell?
- (vi) Forest / Land issues involved in current proposals or previous works in hand.
- (vii) 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 of work on ground. The state must commit to specific timelines in Pre-EC and EC for these processes.

8. Maintenance

The State has proposed a 5-year routine maintenance cost of Rs. 152.99 crore which is 7.47% of construction cost and Rs 522.49 crore which is 25.52% of construction cost for 6th year renewal cost. However, the State was advised that the 6th year renewal cost should be accompanied by a post 5-year guarantee/maintenance period, and such cost should be a part of DPR. Two physical copies of the MoU signed by the Competent Authority on each page of the document should be sent to the Ministry at the earliest.

9. e-Marg

Out of 3685 total workable packages, 84% packages have been locked, 81% contractors have been registered so far and payment using e-marg has been done only in 9.48% packages. State is 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. Progress on e- Marg is quite unsatisfactory as compared to other states and state should bring substantial improvement before EC.

10. R&D Technology

Sl No	Description	Minimum length to be proposed in km	Length proposed in km	Percentage of R& D roads with respect to total length
1	Technology with IRC Specification (Main streaming of Technology) - 10%	347.72		
	i. Waste Plastic and Cold Mix		929.54	26.73%
	ii. Other mainstreaming technology		21.77	0.63%
	Total (a)+(b)		951.31	27.36%
2.	Technology with IRC Accreditation - 5%	173.86	429.42	12.35%
	Total		1380.73	39.71%

27.36% of total road length has been proposed using mainstream technology, against minimum requirement of 10%. and 12.35% of roads have been proposed by using IRC accredited technology against minimum requirement of 5%. Choice of technology should be strictly as per the requirement of the location. The State was further asked to ensure the following: -

- (i) State needs to propose Coir Technology to achieve the target length of 470 km as per Director (P-II) letter dated 23.04.2020. State had informed earlier that Coir Technology would be proposed in coastal districts. However, now State has proposed only 5.49 km, which is not acceptable.
- (ii) State should propose sufficient number of roads with white topping wherever possible especially in areas where frequent deterioration of flexible pavements takes place due to constant contact with moisture.
- (iii) Surface dressing should be proposed on low volume roads, for sufficient length.
- (iv) State must sign MoU with Technology Provider and NRIDA before physically starting the work for Performance Evaluation in all these cases.

11. Maintenance of roads under DLP

SRRDA has utilized Rs. 280.02 crore against its maintenance liability of last 5 years of Rs. 497.17 crore which comes around 56%, whereas 1300 crore has been credited in the SRRDA account in the same period. During 2020-21, against the liability of Rs. 142.02 crore, Rs 65.19 crore has been spent. State has not updated renewal data on OMMAS. Average expenditure on maintenance of roads under DLP is only 56.32% of the total requirement which is much less than the requirement. *It has been communicated vide Ministry's letter dt 12 January, 2021 that for fund release only such proposals which are compliant to para 19.3 (vi) of the programme guidelines shall be considered for release of the 2nd instalment of programme funds. Therefore, state should timely release and spend funds for maintenance of roads.*

12. Progress of PMGSY Works

S.No	SCHEME	SANCTIONED		COMPLETED		BALANCE ROAD LENGTH (Km)/Roads	UNAWARDED BALANCE LENGTH (Km)/Roads
		Nos.	LENGTH (Km)	Nos.	LENGTH (Km)		
1	PMGSY I	15,834	61,162.78	15,247	58,075.32	750.75 (587 Nos.)	40.05 (9 Nos.)
2	PMGSY II	636	3,672.386	341	3,469.85	194.95 (295 Nos.)	4.77 (1 No.)
3	PMGSY III	494	3,327.50	0	0.00	3,327.50 (494 Nos.)	2854.14 (422 Nos.)
4	RCPLWEA	48	485.85	17	223.85	261.51 (31 Nos.)	-
Total:		17,012	68,648.53	15,605	61,769.02	4,534.72 (1407 Nos.)	2898.96 (432 Nos.)

TYPE OF WORK-LSBs

S.No	SCHEME	SANCTION (Nos.)	COMPLETED (Nos.)	Balance (Nos.)	Unaward (Nos.)
1	PMGSY I	530	391	139	1
2	PMGSY II	30	10	20	-
3	PMGSY III	4	-	4	4
4	RCPLWEA	2	-	2	-
	Total:	566	401	165	5

Total 1407 no of road works of length 4534.72 km and 165 Nos of LSBs are pending with the state to complete. State should expedite the progress of balance works.

13. Quality.

Out of 1069 ongoing packages, lab has not been established for 71 packages. Photographs of the labs are to be uploaded even if these are mobile labs. Further, 27 works have not been inspected by SQM even once, out of these 18 works are more than 12 months old. State has 64 active SQMs against the total requirement of 178. State should empanel more number of SQMs or go for hiring of SQMs so that more number of works can be inspected. 36 ATRs of NQM observations in respect of completed works and 127 ATRs of ongoing works are pending with the State. Unsatisfactory grading is 8.50% for completed works, 6.89 % for ongoing works and 24.94% for maintenance works. Various anomalies in respect of SQM inspection have been seen which area as follows:

- (i) Water can be seen stagnant on the surface of the Carriageway, which shows that the CAMBER is INAPPROPRIATE and given Satisfactory by the SQM.
- (ii) Inappropriate pit size to check the structural strength can be seen in many roads. In one of the roads, even circular size pit has been dug which is against the norms.
- (iii) In one of the road works, laboratory condition is very poor, nothing is visible, no proper equipment.
- (iv) In one of the roads, work has been done till base course (WBM -III) still the condition of shoulder is very poor. Still, no FDD test has been conducted on shoulder.
- (v) Poor and casual way of checking thickness of BT layer in the most of the roads.

State was advised to take immediate corrective action and show some improvement in the aforesaid quality issues before the proposal is considered by the Empowered Committee. A clear action plan to improve quality of works and inspections need to be put in place before the State comes for EC. *State should establish Quality Monitoring Cell with requisite manpower for periodic performance evaluation of SQMs/proper examination of SQM reports/guidance to SQMs/submission of proper ATRs on NQM observations etc.*

14. Financial Issues

- (i) Financial closure of 41 physically completed work are pending with the State for more than six months. The State was asked to take immediate action and expedite pending financial closure of completed works. State has an unspent balance of Rs 1104.74 crore and utilization percentage is only 51.97%.

(ii) Expired Bank Guarantee of Rs 0.38 crore, pending stale cheque of Rs. 23.46 crore under programme fund, 0.15 crore under admin fund, adverse balance sheet under central maintenance fund for Rs. 801.59 crore (-), two saving bank accounts in maintenance fund account are the pending financial issues with the State of Odisha. State has to take immediate action on all these issues.

15. 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. It is pertinent to mention that the quality of proposals needs much improvement before the EC is done.

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