

**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 11<sup>th</sup> January, 2022.

**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 2021-22 (Batch-III)-reg.**

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Pre- Empowered Committee held on 23<sup>rd</sup> December, 2021 through Video Conferencing to consider the project proposals for Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III), Batch-III, 2021-22 is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action.



Devinder Kumar)

Director (RC)

Tele No 011 2307 0129

**Distribution:**

- (i) The Additional Chief 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 AS(RC)

**Minutes of the Pre-Empowered Committee Meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2021 for consideration of proposals of the State of Odisha under PMGSY-III, Batch-III of 2021-22**

A meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee was held through Video Conference on 23.12.2021 at 4:00 PM under the chairmanship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG (NRIDA) to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Odisha under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) (Batch-III) of 2021-22. The following officials were present in the meeting: -

<b>Government of India representatives</b>	
Dr. Ashish Kumar Goel	Additional Secretary (RD), MoRD
Shri Devinder Kumar	Director (RC), MoRD
Shri Jitendra Kumar Agrawal	Section Officer (RC), MoRD
Shri BC Pradhan	Consultant (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agrawal	Director (Projects-I), NRIDA
Shri Rajender Goel	Consultant/Director (Project-II), NRIDA
Dr. I.K. Pateriya	Director (Projects-III), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
<b>State Government representatives</b>	
Shri Sudarshan Parida	CEO, Odisha SRRDA
Shri A.K Pradhan	Chief Engineer, Odisha SRRDA
Shri Sudhir Tripathy	SQC, Odisha SRRDA
Shri A.K. Mishra	ITNO, Odisha SRRDA

## **2. Details of Proposal**

The current proposals of the State Govt. under PMGSY-III, Batch-III of 2021-22 are as under:

<b>As per State letter dated</b>					<b>As per OMMAS as on 07.12.2021</b>			
<b>Item</b>	<b>No of Roads</b>	<b>Length (in km/m)</b>	<b>Cost (Rs in crore)</b>	<b>Avg. Cost/km (Lakh)</b>	<b>No of Roads</b>	<b>Length (in km/m)</b>	<b>Cost (Rs in crore)</b>	<b>Avg. Cost/km (Lakh)</b>
Roads	--	--	---	--	446	3085.59	1822.06	59.05*
LSBs					21	1461.83	96.96	6.63/m
Total					446 Roads 21 LSBs	3085.59 Km roads 1461.83 m LSB	1919.02	
<b>*MoRD Share: Rs. 1,039.16 crore</b>					<b>State share: Rs 879.86 crore</b>			
<b>Target: 9400 km</b>					<b>Sanctioned: 6478.05 Km</b>			
<b>*Avg Cost/km excluding Higher Specification (HS) cost is 53.17 lakh/km</b>					<b>Balance: 2921.95 Km</b>			

### 3. General Observations

The State Government of Odisha has been allocated a road length of 9400 Km under PMGSY-III. State has already been sanctioned 6478.05 Km of road length. **State has proposed 163.64 km more than their allocation. State should reduce the excess length proposed.**

All proposals are uploaded and scrutinised by the STAs on OMMAS. 10% of the proposal have been scrutinised by PTA.

### 4. Carriageway width wise and Average cost wise details of road

The State has submitted proposals for 446 roads of 3085.59 km and 21 LSBs of 1461.83 m. Out of 446 roads, 107 roads of length 958.69 km have been proposed with 5.50 m carriage width with average cost of Rs.77.22 lakhs/km (Rs 65.58 Lakh/km excluding higher specification cost), and 339 roads of length 2126.89 km have been proposed with 3.75 m carriage width with average cost of Rs. 50.86 lakhs/km (Rs 47.58 Lakh/km excluding higher specification cost),.

### 5. Length wise proposal details

Out of 446 roads, 144 roads are 3 to 5 km in length with average cost of Rs. 55.27 Lakh/Km and 302 roads are 5 Km and above in length with average cost of Rs. 59.90 Lakh/Km. Average candidate road length is 11.31 Km and average proposed road length is 6.91 km.

*State should justify the inclusion of roads of length less than 5 Km in proposal. State to confirm whether these roads which are less than 5 Km in length are part of a longer candidate road. Also examine their UV and justify their inclusion in proposal. **Road wise list and justification should be given. Roads which are less than 4 Km should be examined critically.***

### 6. Surface wise details of existing roads

Out of the total proposed length of 3085.59 km, 6.59 km is Track, 48.68 km is Gravel/Morrum, 843.76 km is WBM, 1486.40 km is BT, and 700.13 km is CC.

*Pre-EC directed to conduct detailed scrutiny of WBM/track/gravel/Moorum roads, whether these are part of core network and how these roads are eligible to be considered in PMGSY-III. All roads (without BT/CC) need to be examined critically by the State to ensure that these roads are meeting the objectives of PMGSY-III. **NRIDA will send team to Odisha and thoroughly examine these roads on satellite map/ GIS and see if they are as per PMGSY-III guidelines.***

**Another distribution of roads with various proportion of non-BT/CC/WBM should also be made, as it was informed that earlier WBM roads were very prevalent in the state and they need to be upgraded. Roads with more than 25% of non-BT/CC/WBM portion should be examined critically.**

## **7. Distribution of roads based on Traffic Category**

In 3.75 m carriageway width, 56 road of length 329.80 km is in T5 category with average cost Rs 53.03 lakh/km, 273 roads of length 1708.98 km are in T6 category with average cost Rs 50.50 lakh/km, 9 roads of length 80.31 km are in T7 category with average cost Rs 49.99 lakh/km, and 1 road of length 7.81 km is in T9 category with average cost Rs 46.94 lakh/km.

In 5.50 m carriageway width, 1 road of length 4.50 km are in T6 category with average cost Rs 88.30 lakh/km, 25 roads of length 239.27 km are in T7 category with average cost Rs 66.79 lakh/km, 19 roads of length 153.27 km are in T8 category with average cost Rs 84.47 lakh/km, and 62 roads of length 561.65 km are in T9 category with average cost Rs 79.60 lakh/km.

***As this is the last batch of proposals and in the initial batches SD has not been taken as per IRC norms, State should adopt 100% mechanized surface dressing (SD) for all roads of traffic category up to T-6 and 50% for roads T-7 and above upto T8. ATCC based traffic survey needs to be done and results uploaded on OMMAS for T9 roads (63).***

## **8. Average cost trends**

Average cost of roads in 3.75 m carriageway width category in the earlier batch-II was Rs. 50.22 lakh/km which has been increased to Rs. 50.86 lakh/km in the current batch of proposals.

The average cost of roads in 5.50 m carriageway width category in the earlier batch-II was Rs. 74.40 lakh/km which has increased to Rs. 77.22 lakh/km.

*There is significant increase in the cost of roads in 5.5 m carriageway width road. Average cost of roads in few districts like Malkangiri, Mayurbhanj, Ravaged, Sundargarh is higher as compared to other districts and previous sanctions. State was asked to examine this high cost.*

## **9. Details of roads with pavement cost per km**

In 3.75 m carriageway width, 13 nos of roads have pavement cost more than 50 lakh/km. Also, in 5.5 m carriageway width 65 roads have pavement cost more than 55 lakh/km.

*Therefore, state is requested to examine the DPRs of all above high pavement cost in general and to furnish proper justification along with breakdown details for the same. NRIDA should also examine the cost of pavement (layer wise) and find out where it is increasing and bring out the outliers. The state should explore to adopt FDR methodology or other technologies such as cement stabilization (with or without additives) to bring down the pavement cost.*

## **10. Details of roads with non-pavement cost per km**

In 3.75 m carriageway width, 154 nos of roads have non pavement cost more than 15 lakh/km. Also, in 5.5 m carriageway width 73 roads have non pavement cost more than 15 lakh/km. Thus, it is seen that non-pavement cost is quite high in most of the proposals.



Detailed justification is required for such abnormal high non pavement cost. **State should explore adoption of New Technology in protection works to bring down the cost. NRIDA should send a team to the state to examine DPRs and suggest ways to adopt New Technology and bring down the cost.**

#### 11. Details of roads with PCU/day

In case of 3.75 m carriageway width road, 2 roads have PCU more than 2000 and while 114 roads have PCU in the range of 1500-2000. Similarly in case of 5.5 m width carriageway roads, 107 roads have PCU more than 2000. 58 roads have PCU in the range of 5000-10000.

**In case of 5.5 m wide roads, State should identify the roads where PCU/day is more than 6000. State should examine critically those roads for lane width requirement where PCU/day > 6000. As informed by the state adequate land width is not available for these roads. State should revisit these roads and assess possibility of widening for these roads. NRIDA should also check these roads in Geo Sadak. Similarly, 2 roads with more than 2000 PCU, should be widened from 3.75 to 5.5m.**

Independent 3rd party traffic survey and Axle load test survey reports need to be provided where the roads designed with projected traffic more than 1 MSA.

#### 12. Distribution of roads based on widening to various carriageway widths

Pre-Empowered committee observed that out that the State has proposed widening of 272 roads from 3 to 3.75 m, 88 roads from 3.75 to 5.50 m, 1 road from 5 to 5.5 m and 18 roads from 3 to 5.5 m.

*State should clearly indicate the kind of procedure to be followed while doing widening of roads so as to have proper compaction and also explain the methodology of compaction for widened portion. In this regard NRIDA will hold a webinar/ meeting with the state officials.*

*It was also pointed out that the state should explore the use of Full Depth Reclamation (FDR) as it will probably be more economical than conventional method, especially for widening of roads. All such widening should be done through FDR/ cement stabilization techniques.*

**It was further stressed that widening from 3 to 3.75m and 5 to 5.5m generally is prone for inferior quality of construction due to construction methodology, leading to improper impaction. The state needs to have a hard look on these proposals.**

#### 13. Trace Map ranking

Min. Trace Map Rank	Numbers of Proposals	%
1 to 15	364	82%
16 to 50	70	16%
51 to 100	12	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>446</b>	

State was asked to re-check 12 roads on geo-sadak with trace map rank 51 or more and justify them road-wise.

#### 14. Planning Audit (Proposals)

All the proposals have not been uploaded on GeoSadak (current and previously sanctioned).  
**State was asked to get all the proposals uploaded on GeoSadak immediately.**

- i. Some proposals are under audit at NRIDA for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III. Final audit will be shared with the State for compliance.
- ii. Proposal alignment of previously sanctioned roads is still pending to be approved on GeoSadak. All proposals with Trace Map >50, length of Non-BT/CC portion >50% (136 roads)- Road wise justification needs to be submitted by State as how they meet PMGSY-III objectives.
- iii. From the sample trace maps, the following observations were made: -
  - a. Major portion of the road in Malkangiri District (**MRL12-Janbai to AP Border via Ralegada**) is not **benefiting** any population. Will a bridge be required on this road to connect AP? Is there a continuous road on the other side of the border?
  - b. A road in Malkangiri District (**MRL01-Mathili Border to Angurguda**) is not connecting to any BT road on either side.
  - c. Major portion of the road in Nawarangpur District (**MRL06-NH-26 (Dahibhata) to Koraput Dist Boundary via Nuagarh, Parjainiguda, Kadamguda, Pujariguda**) is not benefiting any population. This seems to be a multi-connectivity.
  - d. Major portion of the road in Sambalpur District (**MRL18-Badmal to Badberna via Rengali, Kuakhole**) is not benefiting any habitation.
  - e. A road in Sambalpur District (**MRL02-Jarabaga to Chhotabar upto Block boundary Via Kesaibahail Kendumal**) is parallel alignment.

*State was asked to re-check these roads and justify as to how they meet PMGSY-III objectives.*

#### 15. Proposal checks

- (i) It was observed that in 22 proposals, proposed CC road length is more than existing length of CC length. State was asked to confirm whether CC being re-proposed is out of DLP and **attain economy by use of new technologies.**
- (ii) It was also observed that in 21 proposals, proposed length is more than the eligible length and the variation is more than 15%. State was asked to ensure that non-eligible (PCI>3) length is not being proposed under PMGSY as the same is not eligible.
- (iii) 65 such proposals have been identified which have PCI 2-3 but their cost per km is more than the State's average cost/km. State needs to re-check these 65 roads and justify the same.

#### 16. High Priority roads skipped in CUCPL

It was observed that several high priority roads have been skipped citing different reasons. Committee however observed that these roads (21) should not be skipped until there are being constructed by the owner department or otherwise, they can be included under PMGSY-III. State needs to provide road-wise justification with necessary documents.

## **17. Proposals with good existing surfaces**

5 roads with good existing surface have been proposed for upgradation. It was mentioned that roads having PCI >3 are not eligible under PMGSY-III. State was asked to either drop these roads or give road -wise justification with geo-tagged videos and cost economy. It was also asked to the State that the DPRs should be verified at the SRRDA level. SRRDA may please scrutinize at their level and submit video of proposed alignment.

## **18. 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.
- (ii) State should certify that the roads proposed in current batch are not PMGSY roads which are under design life.
- (iii) As per recent advisory, 3<sup>rd</sup> party traffic verification should be done by the State adopting ATCC for traffic considered more than 1 MSA and the reports should be attached with the DPRs.
- (iv) State should ensure that the design stage Road Safety Audit (RSA) 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.
- (v) New Performa-C (2021) part-1, part-2 and part-3 have not been attached in the DPR. The same may be filled up by PIUs and sent to NRIDA for scrutiny and record.
- (vi) Existing/proposed box culverts, slab culverts, causeways, bridge portion needs to be deducted in pavement quantity to avoid duplication of quantities.
- (vii) Crushable GSB is required to be replaced by moorum or moorum blended with sand, having CBR of 20%, if available, to achieve economy. Moorum may also be explored to be used as screening material in WBM.
- (viii) State should adopt FDR technology/ cement stabilization where the pavement cost is in higher side.
- (ix) State should ensure to propose surface course with mechanized Surface Dressing (SD) for the proposals with traffic category T6 and less for 50% length for T8 & T8. Compliance report of earlier batch's surface dressing should be submitted along with copies of work orders/ revised agreements.
- (x) Provision made for encasing the pipe with M15 concrete needs to be deleted.
- (xi) Boulder Aprons is not required for small culverts. Hence, this needs to be deleted.
- (xii) Provisions for road safety should be as per the recommendation of RSA. It needs to be rationalized as per the site requirement such as sharp curve etc and also the road safety guidelines issued by NRIDA needs to be referred and response from the PIU should also be filled in RSA report.
- (xiii) Case relating to shifting of electric poles & telephone poles, land acquisition etc are to be considered under the higher specification cost.
- (xiv) In DPR overhead charge of 15% is considered against 12.5%, extra 2.5% overhead charge need to be shifted to the higher specification cost. State needs to ensure that it is being correctly considered under higher specification.
- (xv) Bridge Joint Inspection reports need to be provided.

## 19. Maintenance

The State has proposed a 5-year routine maintenance cost of Rs. 132.23 crore which is 7.26% of construction cost and 6<sup>th</sup> year renewal cost of Rs. 436.46 crore which is 23.95% of construction cost. State has been advised that 6<sup>th</sup> year's renewal cost should be accompanied by a post 5-year routine maintenance period and such cost should be a part of the DPRs.

## 20. R& D Technology

State has proposed construction of 1703 roads 2024.30 km using green technology as per the following details

Sl.No	Name of Technology	No of stretches/ roads	Length (in km)	Percentage of R& D roads with respect to total length
A	Main streaming of Technologies			
1	Waste Plastic	275	450.73	25.70%
2	Cold Mix Technology	168	342.16	
	Sub Total	443	792.89	
B				
1	Coir Technology	1	2.57	28.22%
2	CC Block	187	91.27	
3	CELL Filled Concrete	134	69.50	
4	Panelled Cement Concrete	637	397.62	
5	RCCP	45	14.64	
6	Surface Dressing	81	295.00	
	Sub Total	1085	870.6	
C				
1	Nanotac	2	9.20	10.36%
2	Envirotac	21	52.92	
3	Terrazyme	41	72.13	
4	Zycosoil nanotechnology	47	109.51	
5	Nanotechnology water proofing*	39	73.50	
6	Marble Slurry for stabilization	1	2.42	
	Sub Total	151	319.68	
D				
	Other Technologies	24	41.08	1.33%
Total		1703	2024.30	65.60%

The State was advised to propose more roads (at least 50% length) for construction using waste plastics.



State has proposed 730.28 km with CC pavement. All CC roads should be proposed using Cell Filled Concrete/ Panelled Cement Concrete/RCCP/other new technology. Overlay on old CC should not exceed 100-110 mm.

Nanotechnology waterproofing **alone** is not permitted. State should ensure, nanotechnology is also proposed in sub-base/base layer (stabilized).

The State Government was also advised to avoid mechanical distribution of R&D targets to the PIUs. It should be strictly as per the requirement of the location.

**State was also advised to furnish break-up of specific IRC accredited technologies road-wise with justification.**

Roads proposed to be widened from 3 to 3.75m and 5 to 5.5m should be taken up using new technology, so as to attain economy and proper compaction.

Mechanized surface dressing should be undertaken for T6 and below; and 50% for T7 and T8.

**A webinar should be held by NRIDA for use of new technology.**

The State was further asked to ensure the following: -

- (i) State must sign MoU with Technology Provider and NRIDA before physically starting the work for Performance Evaluation in all these cases.
- (ii) State needs to provide performance evaluation reports of earlier sanctioned works and the roads have been completed. No interim reports have been received so far.

## **21. Progress of PMGSY works**

Annual physical target of the State is 2700 Km, out of which, only 320 Km has been completed. State still needs to complete balance target. State assured to complete the target by March 2022. The details of work sanctioned, completed, and pending under PMGSY-I and II are given below.

### **ROADS**

S.No	SCHEME	Length in Km							
		SANCTIONED		COMPLETED		BALANCE		UNAWARDED	
		No. of Roads	Length	No. of Roads	Length	No. of Roads	Length	No. of Roads	Length
1	PMGSY I	15,834	61,162.78	15,545	58,382.52	289	420.84	6	33.75
2	PMGSY II	636	3,672.39	554	3,603.94	82	49.80	0	0.00
3	PMGSY III	985	6,478.06	3	227.57	982	6,250.71	139	918.00
<b>Total:</b>		<b>17,455</b>	<b>71,313.23</b>	<b>16,102</b>	<b>62,214.03</b>	<b>1,353</b>	<b>6,721.35</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>951.75</b>

## **LSBs**

<b>S.No</b>	<b>SCHEME</b>	<b>SANCTION (Nos.)</b>	<b>COMPLETED (Nos.)</b>	<b>Balance (Nos.)</b>	<b>Unawarded (Nos.)</b>
1	PMGSY I	530	446	84	1
2	PMGSY II	30	21	9	0
3	PMGSY III	71	0	71	19
<b>Total:</b>		<b>631</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>20</b>

Out of the total works sanctioned under PMGSY-I, II & III, 145 roads remain unawarded as on date. State needs to expedite the tender process of these works. State has assured that all the balance works under PMGSY-I & II will be completed before the deadline of 30<sup>th</sup> September 2022.

### **22. e-MARG**

Out of total 8280 packages pushed to e-MARG, 377 packages are pending for locking, 424 packages are pending for manual entry expenditure (MEE). 4833 roads are eligible for routine inspection in November 2021, 2980 roads (62%) are pending for routine inspection (RI). 5403 (69%) packages are pending for payment for >6 months. 3822 (71%) packages are pending for payment for first payment for > 6 months. Payment of Rs.46.86 crore has been done using e-MARG in FY 2021-22. Total expenditure of Rs. 24.32 crore has been done on bills having liability of FY 2021-22. **The state was asked to saturate 100% roads on eMARG before sanction of projects.**

### **23. Maintenance of roads under DLP**

During 2020-21, against the liability of Rs. 142.11 crore, expenditure of Rs. 80.56 crore has been done which is only 56.68% of liability. For the current financial year 2021-22, the maintenance liability is 166.16 crore and as on 22.12.2021, the expenditure is only Rs. 23.10 crore. State has not updated/credited any amount in SRRDA's account from 2020-21 to 2021-22. Therefore, State was asked to intimate/update the fund released to SRRDA under DLP during the above-mentioned periods. State has also not updated length renewal data and expenditure data for renewal of roads. State was asked to update the same on priority, and certainly before the EC meeting.

### **24. Quality**

(a) Out of 1324 ongoing packages, QC labs **have not been established in 194 packages.**

(b) Number of active SQMs are 34 against requirement of 190 SQMs. During 2021-22, 7672 SQM inspections are targeted and till date, only 3409 inspections have been conducted. There are 3 works which have not been inspected even once. The state needs to increase the pace of SQM inspections and meet the target.

***Increased inspections should be done for those roads where the bids were seriously below the estimated amount. Out of 602 awarded works analyzed under PMGSY-III, 192 works were bid less than 12%. These works need more intense inspections to maintain quality.***

(c) 91 ATRs are pending at State Level. **State should show substantial compliance for these pending ATRs before they come for sanction of new projects.**

(d) Unsatisfactory grading by NQM from November 2018 to November 2021 for completed works is 7.71%, for ongoing works it is 7.33% and for maintenance works it is 28.74% which is quite unsatisfactory. The State was advised to take immediate corrective action and show some improvement in the aforesaid indicators.

(e) Some anomalies noticed in SQM inspections are as under: -

(i) Wrong way of checking volumetric analysis OR06-67, OR03222

(ii) Wrong way of checking Super elevation OR01156, OR01156

(iii) From April 2021 to December 2021, out of 3439 inspection, 456 PDF reports have not been uploaded yet.

(iv) In many inspections between January 2021 to December 2021, poor condition of road furniture is graded as 'Satisfactory'.

(v) Lab photographs for many ongoing roads have not been uploaded.

The state should re-orient the SQMs so that these deficiencies do not recur.

## **25. Financial Issues**

(a) Financial closure of 28 no of works is pending for more than 180 days. The State may take immediate action and expedite pending financial closure of completed works.

(b) Annual State budget of PMGSY is not reflected in PFMS TSRY-07 report. State was asked to look into this and take appropriate action.

(c) Heavy expenditure has been incurred under the Head Travel Expenses (Expenses incurred is Rs.9.10 crore and Expenditure limit is Rs. 3.52 crore). Detailed justification is required from the state.

(d) Stale cheques are pending for a very large amount. (Programm fund: Rs. 25.20 crore, Admin: Rs. 0.16 crore & Int: Rs. 4.76 crore). Bank Guarantee amounting to Rs. 0.16 crore has expired. Bank has deducted TDS amounting to Rs. 15.99 crore, which needs to be refunded. The State was asked to look into these financial issues and take appropriate action.

**26.** 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.

\*\*\*\*\*