

No. P-17024/1/2021-RC (FMS No 374264)

Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 15th June, 2021

Minutes

Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Jharkhand for Road Connectivity Project under Left Wing Extremism Area (RCPLWEA) (Batch-I, 2021-22)-reg.

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on 4th June, 2021 through Video Conferencing (VC ID No. 3473246748) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Jharkhand for Road Connectivity Project under Left Wing Extremism Area (RCPLWEA) (Batch-I, 2021-22) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action.

2. This issues with the approval of the competent authority.


(Kirti Gupta) 15/6

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India

Distribution:

- i. The Secretary, Rural Works Department-cum-Chief Executive Office, Jharkhand State Rural Roads Development Authority, F.F.P Building, 2nd Floor, Dhurwa, Ranchi- 834004
- ii. Shri Jay Prakash Singh, Chief Engineer, JSRRDA
- iii. Shri Nishant Kumar Mishra, Deputy Secretary (LWE), Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, New Delhi
- iv. All Directors in NRIDA.

Copy to:-

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

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 4th June, 2021 AT 3.00 PM TO CONSIDER THE PROJECTS UNDER Batch-I OF PMGSY-RCPLWEA (2021-22)

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (RC) was held through Video Conference on **4th June, 2021 at 3.00 PM** under the Chairpersonship of Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA to consider the project proposal submitted by the State of Jharkhand under PMGSY-RCPLWEA (Batch-I) of 2021-22. Following officers were present in the meeting :-

Central Govt. Representatives	
Dr. Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary, (RC), MoRD & DG (NRIDA)
Shri K.M.Singh	Deputy Secretary (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
Shri Nishant Kumar Mishra	Deputy Secretary, MHA
State Govt. Representatives	
Dr. Manish Ranjan	Secretary-cum-CEO, RWD, Jharkhand
Shri Ram Kumar Sinha	Additional Secretary
Shri Ashok Kumar	SQC, JSRRDA
Shri Praveen Kumar Jha	Nodal Officer, JSRRDA
Shri Surender Prasad	EE, JSRRDA
Shri Sobodh Paswan	AE, JSRRDA
Shri Dinesh Pradhan	Finance Controller, JSRRDA
Shri Manish Keshri	IT Nodal Officer, JSRRDA

1. Details of RCPLWEA (Additional) Proposal: -

As per state letter dated 22.1.2021					As per OMMAS dated 02.6.2021			
Item	No of works	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)	Nos	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)
Up-Gradation	125	780.86	731.19	93.64	125	780.86	711.24	91.08
Bridges	69	-	-	-	72	4369.49	167.34	3.83/m
Total					125 roads & 72 LSBs	780.86 Km & 4369.49 m	878.58*	

*MoRD Share : Rs. 518.62 Crore

State Share : Rs. 359.96 Crore

3.75 m width road – 122 Nos & Length - 724.99 Km - Rs. 89.63 Lakh/Km

5.50 m width road – 03 No & Length - 55.81 Km - Rs. 110.03 Lakh/Km

Signature

2. General Observations:

i) In respect of Jharkhand, MHA had recommended 129 roads with total length of 810.00 km and 12 bridges/culverts within the outlay of Rs.725.00 crores. State has proposed 125 roads and 72 bridges at a financial outlay of Rs.878.58 crores. Committee inquired the following: -

- a. Whether all the proposed 125 roads of the proposal are the same as those recommended/ approved by MHA.
- b. The reason behind enhancing no. of bridges from 12 to 72.
- c. Whether 72 bridges are located on the same alignment of these proposed 125 roads? Whether the standalone bridges in this proposal are the same as those recommended/ approved by MHA.

ii) State clarified that they have proposed 71 bridges instead of 72. 12 bridges approved by MHA are standalone bridges. Out of 12, 2 bridges have been dropped as they have been completed by other agencies. State has opted 10 standalone bridges in the present proposal. Out of 71, 61 additional bridges are falling on same alignment of proposed 125 roads. **The state needs to confirm this in writing.**

iii) Committee advised state to segregate the proposal of bridges into two parts such as (a) Long Span Bridges and (b) LSB, which are in effect box culverts, in order to scrutinize the cost of bridges/ culverts separately. It was also asked to do cost examination based on the above criteria. As construction cost of box culverts is less than the standalone LSBs, the cost analysis/ examination should be done separately for both these categories.

iv) All proposals are uploaded and scrutinized by the STAs on OMMAS. State informed that for RCPLWEA, BIT Mesra (STA) is the authorized STA. PTA scrutiny of the proposals is yet to be carried out. IIT, Bhubaneshwar is the PTA in the present case. They informed that they have not received any proposal for scrutiny at yet. **State was asked to take necessary action for PTA scrutiny urgently, and certainly before the EC meeting.**

v) The average cost of roads was found to be very high. NRIDA informed that the reason behind high cost is because use of BM and SDBC for road below T5 category for so called 'longer durability'. It was explained to the State that specifications of PMGSY roads, as per rural road manual, ensure durability and with proper maintenance average life of road is 10 years. As such higher cost for construction on the durability ground cannot be justified. Design of roads should be based on traffic consideration and engineering design. If the state is taking all the roads under MB-SDBC, then even the maintenance cost will be very high and it will need specialized machinery.

State referred to a meeting held in 2017, where it was stated that roads under RCPLWEA should be thicker and clarified that the BM and SDBC roads are proposed for strengthening of roads for security purpose and keeping in view LWE activity as State cannot maintain these roads on regular basis being in the LWE affected area. On these lines, from last three years' proposals were considered with the same specification on the above basis on same average cost. It was

be. Singh

decided that STA scrutiny of these proposals should be done again properly as per traffic condition.

The recommendations of Sub-Committee on Inter Ministerial Empowered Committee (IMEC) for Road Connectivity Project for Left Wing Extremism (RCPLWEA) Affected Areas under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY), dated 7th November 2017, was gone through. According to the decision taken by this IMEC, amongst the road specifications which will enhance security, were provision of a loop, greater width of roads and thicker bituminous crust of roads required from security angle. It was agreed that while total bomb proofing of road and bridge works is not possible but since the roads in such areas could not be built nor can be maintained frequently it would be in the interest of security to build roads with higher specifications than specified in relevant IRC Guidelines. The design of roads will be as per IRC guidelines for relevant category of roads, also keeping in view the security perspective and expected traffic after construction of roads

Director (Tech), NRIDA, therefore, recommended that BM and SDBC of 75mm width is excessive, and 40 mm SDBC is suitable to provide for thicker bituminous surface compared to the usual IRC specifications, as recommended by Sub-Committee on Inter Ministerial Empowered Committee (IMEC). This type of road is sustainable and can last of a design life of 10 years with minimal maintenance. It was also pointed out that in NONE of the other states implementing RCPLWEA, the provision of 75mm BM+SDBC has been done for low volume traffic roads. If the state wants richer specifications than suggested, then they may bear the extra cost.

vi) Average cost of 3.75 m width roads has increased from 72.92 lakh/km (2019) to 89.63 lakh/km (2021) i.e. by 22.91% in less than 2 years. State informed that many roads under this category require earth cutting. Roads which come under wild life sanctuary area have been proposed to be built with CC pavement as per the requirements for obtaining forest clearance. In some area, materials are to be transported from a long distance which requires higher construction cost.

It was inquired from the state that in how many cases forest clearance is required. State failed to give a clear cut position with regard to this and told that the same is being compiled. It was observed that as the state is in advance stage of submission of proposal, they should have firmed up this figure before submitting the proposal. It was observed that since the state does not allow black topping of road in forest area, it should be ensured that they would allow CC road in forest area. State officials informed that construction of CC road is allowed in forest area. On a specific query, it was informed that 50 km of road comes under wild life area which requires constructions of CC pavement. These roads are mainly in Garwah and Latehar districts. State informed that forest clearance will not be any issue for CC roads, only bitumen road is not allowed. *Keeping in view the current status of pending forest clearances in the state, how can the state be sure of getting forest clearance in a limited time need to be looked into. The state should come up with a detailed status in this regard for previous works and those proposed now. As per the current information, 14 projects which have been sanctioned for more than a year, are still obstructed due to lack of forest clearance.*



vii) State was asked to provide the details of CD works in each and every road including the category of LSB. Whether the cost of CD works has been included in pavement cost, should be examined.

3. Distribution of roads based on Traffic Category and issues related to them: -

i) State was asked to clarify the reasons for such a high cost for the roads for less than T3 traffic category. State informed that the cost of road should not be linked to traffic and the specifications is based purely on security consideration. It was explained that volume of traffic is an important factor for deciding the specifications of roads. For 98 roads of less than T3 category, average total cost comes to 92.36 lakh/ km, which is quite high. The reason for higher cost is apparently inclusion of BM and SDBC. It was reiterated that design of road should be based on traffic condition and there are options available to reduce the cost while keeping the security and the requirement of less maintenance in consideration.

ii) It was stated that the provision of 24 lakh/km in other costs is on higher side. State clarified that this is because they have uploaded the entire length of roads as approved by MHA on OMMAS but the actual working length is less and hence this cost will get reduced. There is already some CC work in place on these roads. It was pointed out that there is wrong entry on OMMAS for construction of actual length. There is anomaly in actual length of road as per DPR, vis-à-vis, length mentioned on OMMAS. **Even STA has not scrutinized this. However, STA pointed out that they have considered it and mentioned in remarks column. It was decided that the State will correct this anomaly quickly. State has failed to project the cost correctly and due to this taking a view in the matter would be difficult.**

iii) On the issue of higher cost for lower category roads, STA clarified that design of these roads was made by the State as per the cost estimates of the last two years. It was further asked whether they have taken into consideration the existing pavement composition while designing the overlay. State clarified that all these roads are existing earthen roads. In T3 and T4 roads, State has proposed 150 mm Granular Sub Base (GSB), 150 mm WMM, 150 mm BM and 25 mm SDBC.

iv) It was inquired why there is difference of approx. 3 lakhs/km in average pavement cost between T3 and T4 category roads. State clarified that cost enhancement in T3 roads from T4 is because of requirement of 9-10 m cutting in some roads and due to 110 km distance of lead area etc. This explanation is not acceptable, this issue needs proper examination.

v) Chairman asked NRIDA to check the DPRs using the exception rules. NRIDA was advised to get the necessary data from the SRRDA in an excel sheet (component wise costs etc) such that rules can be applied and proper examination of DPRs can be done.

vi) CD cost, protection work, culvert, retaining works, utility shifting, road safety etc. are covered under non-pavement cost. It should be checked whether the cost of CD works is included in the pavement or non-pavement cost, and the situation should be rectified, if required.



4. District wise cost variations and reasons therefore :

i) Committee noticed the high pavement cost in some districts such as Dhanbad, Gumla, Hazaribagh, Khunti, Latehar, Purbi Singhbhum, Saraikela Kharsawan and Simdega.

State informed that they have included earth work cutting cost, CD works cost below 15 mtr in pavement cost. Chief Engineer, Jharkhand replied that CD works below 15 mtr are included in pavement cost. It was further observed that if CD cost is included in pavement cost, then non-pavement cost is very high, un-reasonable and un-sustainable.

ii) State was further inquired about higher cost of 101.90 lakh/km in Hazaribagh, the clarified that at one road, there is provision of guard wall, extra CC pavement, culvert. In Simdega District (non-pavement cost -110.41 lakh/km), the cost is more due to distance of lead.

State needs to justify the cost of these DPRs. State was asked to provide justification of cost enhancement in an excel sheet of all 125 roads alongwith proper photographs where extra work has been proposed. The same is to be sent within two days.

5. DPR Issues (Roads): -

- Transect walk photos and gram Sabha resolutions are not attached with the DPR.
- 1% extra provision for labour cess in the SoR is also added in the total project cost. The same should be deleted from the total project cost to avoid duplication.
- The certified test results for GSB material indicating LL, PI, MDD, OMC, and CBR have not been found attached to the DPR.
- Hard shoulder of GSB quality material is proposed for both sides for a width of 1.875 m.

State mentioned that hard shoulder is made of murem only with cost of Rs. 800 per MQ with 100 mm thickness. It was further explained that after construction of road, the traffic will also enhance. Cost of murem hard shoulder will be approx. 2-2.5 lakh/km. The same specification was adopted in last two years as well.

It was pointed out that there is no need of hard shoulder in each and every T3 and T4 category roads where CBR of soil/ earthen shoulders is acceptable. On roads which have lesser CBR, hard shoulder may be provided, depending on the traffic conditions. In such a case, road wise justification needs to be given.

- Typical X-sections of the Proposed and existing road should be provided with the DPR.
- State has attached the Format F-9A & 9B. But no officer has authorized the formats. State should correct and submit.
- Two layers of Tack coat has been proposed in the BM overlay only one layer of Tack coat is to be provided and extra layer of tack coat should be deleted. However, this would be applicable only if BM is taken up.
- The state need to confirm that whether while designing of the overlay thickness due consideration has been made towards the existing pavement materials as per para 2.2.3 and Para 6 of IRC SP 72:2015. It should also be clarified that how many roads are upgradation roads and how many are new connectivity.

Le. Hmt

- Average pavement cost of the proposals relating to 3.75 m carriage in the district of Gumla, Haziribag, Latehar, Pashchim Singhbhum, Purbi Singhbhum, Saraikela Kharsawan and Simdegha are on higher side which needs justification.
- Similarly for 5.5 m carriageway the average pavement cost in the district of Chatra and Pashchim Singhbhum are on higher side and needs justification.
- The average cost towards other items such as CD Works, Protection works and other costs in case of Bokaro, Dhanbad, Khunti, Saraikela Kharsawan and Simdega for 3.75 m carriageway are on higher side.
- Similarly for 5.5 m carriageway the average cost towards other items in case of Chatra and Paschim Singhbhum is on higher side.
- Crash barrier should be provided in lieu of RCC railing as it has maintenance free long service life.

Bridges

- Superstructure design analysis is not given in the DPR. MORT&H drawings for the superstructure of span 12.5m have been attached and there is no design of superstructure. These drawings are based on working stress method (WSM) WSM, so need to redesign by Limit State Method (LSM) using IRC 112-2011 and IRC6: 2017 and other relevant codes of practices.
- Provision for "Acceptance Load Test" on one span of bridge as per IRC code before opening to traffic shall be made in DPR. **This should be part of bidding document. No separate cost item should be added in DPR.**
- Provision of Test pile and routine pile load testing should be made in DPR along with PIT on each pile for bridges.
- Scheme of Replacement of bearings shall be given in the DPR with the number of jacks required, load capacity of each jack to lift the span.

State was asked for compliance of the above observations before EC meeting.

6. Maintenance: -

State has proposed Rs 4469.98 lakhs (6.28 % of Construction Cost) for 5 years Routine Maintenance and Rs 13707.68 lakhs (19.27% % of Construction Cost) for 6th year's renewal to be borne by State Govt. This is agreed to.

7. R&D technology: -

State has not proposed roads under mainstream technology, State needs to adopt minimum 10% length for other main streaming technology such as RCCP, stabilized sub-base/base etc. Besides this state needs to adopt adequate length of Waste Plastic technology i.e more than 10% under main streaming conventional technology.

8. Progress of works:-

Out of 115 road works works (31 works of phase I and 84 of phase II), only 15 road works (13 of phase of and 2 of phase II) are completed. Similarly out of total 97 LSBs (72 of phase-I and 25 of phase-II), only 44 LSBs of phase-I have been completed. Rest 110 road works of phase-I and

W. J. J.

II and 28 LSBs of phase-I and 25 LSBs of phase-II are pending for completion. 2 roads and 1 bridge of phase-II are still unawarded.

State informed that proposal for dropping of these 2 roads and 1 LSB has been sent to NRIDA, but there is a requirement of revised mandatory certificate. State was asked to give a timeline for completion of pending works. In any case all these works are to be completed by March 23.

14 proposals (3 road works and 2 LSBs of phase I and 9 road works of phase II) are stuck due to forest clearance. State informed that they are trying to resolve the issue with forest department within 10-15 days. 2 roads and 1 LSB are proposed for dropping. State was asked to resolve the pending forest clearance by 15th July else these would be frozen on OMMAS .

9. Quality Issue :-

1. The number of SQMs required for inspection of RCPLWE works as conveyed by MoRD, is 37 against which only 8 SQMs are active on OMMAS. Services of SQMs empanelled with PMGSY unit of Jharkhand, may be utilized for inspections of RCPLWE works also and assignment to all the SQMs should be given for at least 10-15 days every month.
2. The target of SQM inspections for RCPLWE is 1,340 for 2021-22 against which only 3 inspections were carried out in April 2021, which is substantially low. The pace of inspections needs to be increased by deputing all the available SQMs to their full capacity.
3. QC labs have not been established on 11 packages out of total 130 ongoing packages of RCPLWE. Works are progressing, without labs. State must ensure that these labs are established according to recently issued instructions.

State informed that for hiring of SQMs, there is a walk-in-interview on 25th June, 2021. The same has been published in the Newspaper. State was advised to give this a wide publicity by circulating this Notice among retired Engineering officers and on NRIDA website also.

10. Representative from MHA raised the following issues:

- i. In the last review meeting by SRD and Home Secretary, State had assured that all 72 bridges sanctioned in the first batch will be completed by March, 2021, but State has completed only 42 bridges. Hence, pending bridges should be completed as soon as possible.

State informed that due to prevailing lock down, the progress was hampered. MHA representative was also informed that Ministry has issued a circular about dropping of the works which are not going to be completed on account of forest clearance by 15th July, 2021 and if the works are not completed finally by 31st March, 2023 they will be frozen on OMMAS and no expenditure would be allowed to be incurred on these works from the fund provided by the Government of India.

- ii. Apart from the already approved roads & bridges for Jharkhand, MHA had recently recommended the proposal of the State for 129 roads and 12 bridges (810 km length) with tentative cost of Rs. 725 crores. However, the State has proposed 125 roads (780.80 km) with enhanced cost of Rs. 878.58 crores. Recently, State has forwarded additional

proposal of around 1000 km. In view of limited budget available under the scheme and also in view of the fact that needs of other LWE affected States are also to be catered to, extent of approval regarding the proposal will have to be looked into.

Committee inquired from the State the reason for higher cost of the proposal than initially agreed to and recommended by MHA. State informed that the cost estimates arrived at the time of furnishing the proposal initially was a tentative one and the same has been revised now based on the current SOR.

Committee decided that State will give their proposal within the limit of approved budget and submit their revised proposal as per the observations above.

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

