


Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 28th October, 2021

Minutes

Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Uttar Pradesh under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) for the 2021-22 (Batch-I)-reg.

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Empowered Committee held on 21st October, 2021 through Video Conferencing to consider the project proposals submitted by State of Uttar Pradesh under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action. The State Government is requested to furnish compliance on the observations of EC on priority.



(K.M.Singh)

Deputy Secretary (RC)
Tel. No. 011- 2307 0308

Distribution:

- (i) The Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1st Floor, Bappu Bhawan, Schivalaya, Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow:- 226001.
- (ii) The Chief Executive Officer, UPRRDA, Lucknow.
- (iii) The Chief Engineer, Department of Rural Development, Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1st Floor, Bappu Bhawan, Schivalaya, Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow:- 226001.
- (iv) The Adviser (RD), NITI Aayog, NITI Aayog Bhavan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.
- (v) The Director, Central Roads Research Institute, Mathura Road, New Delhi.
- (vi) The Secretary General, Indian Road Congress, Kama Koti Marg, Ranjit Nagar, Sector-6, Rama Krishna Puram, New Delhi-110037
- (vii) The Chief Engineer, Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, Parivahan Bhavan, New Delhi.
- (viii) The Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Cooperation and Farmer's Welfare, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi.
- (ix) All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5th Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110001.

Copy to:-

PS to Hon'ble MRD/PS to Hon'ble MoS/ Sr. PPS to Secretary (RD)/PPS to AS (RD)/PPS to AS&FA/PPS to JS(RC).

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 21ST OCTOBER, 2021 AT 2:30 P.M. TO CONSIDER PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF UTTAR PRADESH UNDER PMGSY III, BATCH I, 2021-22

A Meeting of the Empowered Committee (RC) was held through Video Conference on **21st October, 2021 at 2:30 PM** under the Chairmanship of Secretary (RD) to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Uttar Pradesh under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III), Batch-I of 2021-22. Following officials were present in the meeting.

Shri Nagendra Nath Sinha	Secretary (RD)
Ms. Alka Upadhyay	Additional Secretary (RD)
Dr. Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary, (RC), MoRD
Shri Mam Chand	Director (IFD), MoRD
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
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri Manoj Kumar Singh	Additional Chief Secretary, RD& Panchayati Raj
Shri Bhanu Chandra Goswami	Chief Executive officer, UPRRDA
Shri P.D.Upadhyay	Financial Controller, UPRRDA
Shri Brijesh Kumar Dubey	SQC, UPRRDA
Shri D.D. Pathak	Senior Engineer Technical, UPRRDA
Er. Mohammad Murtaza	ITNO, UPRRDA

2. Details of Proposal

Item	As per Pre-EC				As per OMMAS dated 19.10.2021			
	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost* (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km (Lakhs)
Roads	958	7341.84	5465.27	74.44	1099	8403.16	6073.64	72.28
LSBs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	958 roads + NIL LSBs	7341.84 km roads + 0.00 m LSBs	5465.27		1099 roads + NIL LSBs	8403.16 km roads + 0.00 m LSBs	6073.64	
*MoRD Share : Rs. 3640.65 Crore Target : 18937.50 km		State share : Rs 2432.99 Crore Sanctioned : 6287.38 km						

3.75 m width road - 914 Nos & Length - 6605.47 km - Rs. 63.14 Lakhs/km
 5.50 m width road - 185 Nos & Length - 1797.70 km - Rs. 105.86 Lakhs/km

3. General Observations

(i) The State Government of Uttar Pradesh has been allocated road length of 18,937.50 km under PMGSY-III. The first batch of proposals of 398 roads of 6,287.37 km and 5 Bridges of 134.40 m worth Rs 4,177.80 crore (Central Share Rs 2,506.33 crore and State Share Rs 1,671.47 crore) have already been sanctioned to the State.

(ii) The State has now submitted proposals for 1099 roads of length 8,403.16 k.m. Out of 1099 roads, 914 roads of 6,605.47 km have been proposed with 3.75 m carriageway width and 185 roads of 1,797.70 km road length have been proposed with carriageway width of 5.50 m.

(iii) All proposals have been uploaded and scrutinized by the STAs on OMMAS. However, PTA scrutiny has not yet been done. PTA scrutiny should be ensured before the clearance and its observations should be implemented in all the DPRs.

(iv) 43 roads have been proposed under FDR technology at an average total cost of Rs. 76.10 lakh/ km. 871 roads have been proposed under conventional technology at an average total cost of Rs. 62.59 lakh/ km. A comparison sheet of roads under FDR technology of the proposal that was proposed with conventional technology in previous batch was made by NRIDA which showed a decrease of Rs. 5.79 lakh/ km (3.75 m carriageway width) with FDR technology. Major change was seen in 5.50 m carriageway width which showed a decrease of Rs. 32.65 lakh/ km (saving of 23%).

(v) Under FDR technology, state has proposed SAMI layer and bituminous course (BC) rather than surface dressing in T3, T4 & T5 category roads. While under conventional technology, state has proposed surface dressing upto T5 category. State was asked to clarify the basis for selection of roads under FDR. It was explained by the state that from the earlier batch, 292 roads of 3.75 m wide and 5.50 m wide having pavement cost over a threshold limit was decided to be brought under FDR.

4. Traffic wise details of road

Sl No	Traffic details	3.75 m carriageway width				5.50 m carriageway width			
		Nos	Length in km	Avg. pav cost/ km	Avg total cost/km	Nos	Length in km	Avg pav cost/ km	Avg total cost/km
1.	Others(RQI)	4	39.4	13.57	18.22				
2.	T3	80	589.255	51.84	64.48				
3.	T4	440	3068.736	51.96	62.46	9	73.385	80.34	94.23
4.	T5	245	1818.402	51.15	62.20	19	204.59	67.69	81.11
5.	T6	104	774.305	58.70	67.72	21	217.072	82.01	92.36
6.	T7	41	315.367	53.56	66.94	16	149.414	89.64	101.62
8.	T9					120	1153.238	100.40	114.10
Grand Total		914	6605.47	52.36	63.14	185	1797.70	92.74	105.86

5. **Analysis based on PCU data**

PCU values of 185 roads proposed for upgradation to 5.50 m		
Sl No	PCU value	No of roads
1.	> 5500	27
2.	> 4500 and less than 5500	44
3.	> 3500 and less than 4500	47
4.	> 2500 and less than 3500	18
5.	> 2000 and less than 2500	36
6.	< 2000	13
Grand Total		185

i) 13 no. of roads of 5.5 m width have PCU value of less than 2000. This issue was flagged during the pre-EC meeting also, to which state told that all these roads have PCU value > 2000 and data may not have been uploaded correctly. It was told to state that discrepancy which has been pointed out at pre-EC level should have been taken care of when the State has sent the proposal for EC. It was directed that a third-party verification should be done in the matter by the state and results communicated to NRIDA.

ii) A team was deputed from NRIDA to visit the state and look into the anomalies of the DPRs. After the visit, the state has reduced Rs. 97.26 crore under FDR technology (43 roads of 3.75 m width and 108 of 5.50 m width). However, as on date, the net reduction in the estimate as shown in OMMAS is Rs. 86.95 crore. State should confirm whether they still have to upload the data or this is the final figure. Further, saving of Rs. 254 crore was made under conventional technology related DPRs.

6. **District wise details of current proposal**

i) It was observed that the cost has increased abnormally after pre-EC in districts of Aligarh, Bareilly, Fatehpur (5.50 m width), Firozabad, Kanpur dehat, Pratapgarh and Shahjahanpur. State was asked to check if the cost of the same roads have increased or some new roads have been added whose average cost is high. State responded that it is because, at the time of pre-EC, GST was not added in some of the proposals. Committee suggested that the proposal should be checked at the level of SRRDA to avoid such errors. State responded that DPRs are uploaded on OMMAS by PIU and the same is directly sent to NRIDA. There is no mechanism for SRRDA to intervene. However, the reasons for such increase should be analysed and communicated by the SRRDA to NRIDA.

ii) Dir (T), NRIDA mentioned that when the observations are sent by NRIDA, state may go through the similar line of observation to identify the outliers at their level. State should at least check the DPRs before final uploading on OMMAS. Committee concurred with the point made by NRIDA and said that while at the time of pre-EC one can understand that the DPRs may not have been scrutinized by the state but at the time of EC, observation made in the pre-EC should be gone through by the state as well. SRRDA should own the process of DPR approval. State requested to develop a mechanism with which DPRs are sent to SRRDA before uploading on OMMAS. Committee mentioned that this suggestion will be examined.

7. **Trace Map Cut- Quality of Roads**

Min. Trace Map Rank	Numbers of Proposals	%
1 to 15	641	58.33
16 to 50	346	31.48
51 to 100	89	8.10
> 100	23	2.09
Total	1099	

i) As per OMMAS & CUCPL, the excluded roads meet the exclusion criteria. However, State and NRIDA may further examine the roads with trace map rank greater than 50 to ensure that they meet the objectives of PMGSY-III.

8. **Planning Audit (Proposals)**

i) Out of 1099 proposals, 265 sample proposals were checked on GEOSADAK and justification was asked for 27 no. of roads. State has submitted the justification. It was observed that, justification for 10 proposals is satisfactory, 5 proposals have been dropped by state, 12 proposals still have issues which require further modifications/justifications.

ii) 5 proposals in Siddharthnagar district have been identified where proposed length and length drawn on GEOSADAK is not matching. State may get it re-checked.

iii) One proposed alignment in Hardoi district is mostly a new alignment connecting only one habitation with a population of 233. Percentage of non BT/CC is also 99.1% which shows that the road is almost a kutchha road.

iv) All the balance proposals should be uploaded on GEOSADAK

v) 60 such proposals were identified where proposed length was 15% more than the eligible length. It was observed that CUCPL length is more than the DRRP length. State mentioned that they have verified it from the actual site and the length as per DRRP is wrong. It was discussed that once a length is entered in the DRRP, it continues to be the same. Rectification in DRRP is not allowed. It was decided that these lengths should be physically verified by the state. NRIDA was also asked to verify with the geo-tagged photos along with the KML file.

vi) Proposals with good existing surfaces were pointed out during pre-EC and 41 such roads were shared with the state by NRIDA. State has dropped 9 such roads.

vii) State has requested for exemption of guidelines in respect of 7 roads of the Pratapgarh district where candidate road length is less than 5 km. Candidate road length of less than 5 km is not eligible as per guidelines. NRIDA mentioned that these roads are not under the current batch of proposals. Untill this provision is enabled, the state cannot enter the proposals in the module. It was mentioned that this is an issue of next batch and will be discussed later on.

9. **General Observations & DPR issues**

- i) State needs to provide a copy of SLSC approval, MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats and consent letters of Hon'ble MPs on final proposal.
- ii) State should certify that the roads proposed in current batch are not PMGSY roads which are under design life.
- iii) State has not provided 3rd party traffic verification report by adopting ATCC for traffic considered more than 1 MSA. State was asked to furnish the same at the earliest.
- iv) State has not furnished design stage road safety audit for all the proposed roads of length more than 5 km. The state was asked to conduct road safety audit and the reports should be attached with the DPRs ensuring appropriate compliance to the recommendation made in the report.
- v) State should upload the revised Performa-C as per corrected cost on OMMAS.
- vi) State has adopted FDR technology for roads in T3-T9 category. In T3-T5 category roads, state has adopted base stabilization with required thickness as per IRC:SP;72:2015. However, the state has proposed SAMI layer and 30 mm BC over the stabilized base, while as per code, only surface dressing is recommended above this stabilized base and there is no provision for SAMI layer and 30 mm BC. NRIDA mentioned that using SAMI layer has a financial implication of Rs. 2.83 lakhs/ km for single lane and Rs. 4.15 lakhs/ km for intermediate lane. In T3-T5, overall there is a financial implication of Rs. 8.23 crore. Similarly in BC, there is a financial implication of Rs.13.42 crore which results in an overall financial implication of Rs. 21.65 crore in the proposal of this base. NRIDA mentioned that the issue was also discussed with Prof. Veerraghaavan, IIT Chennai. He also confirmed that upto T5, there is no need of SAMI layer and 30 mm BC. Surface dressing will perform much better in such low volume traffic, because surface dressing will act as a crack retarder. State was asked to go by the opinion of the experts and correct the DPRs. However, if the State still wants to use the SAMI layer and 30 mm BC, state may go ahead by supplementing the funds from the state govt for the specification over and above what is admissible as per the IRC guidelines and Rural Road Manual.

10. **Pre-EC Compliance**

- i) RQI roads were included in 'others' category. State was asked to analyze RQI roads separately from upgradation proposal so as to get a general idea of average cost of both the kinds. State has submitted a separate sheet for RQI roads and it was observed that 18 roads of 151.236 km are proposed for RQI whose average cost is Rs. 21.29 lakhs/ km.
- ii) In the district wise details of proposal, it was observed that the average cost is high in many districts and the state was advised to adopt cement stabilization (apart from FDR) in base course (as per IRC:SP:72-2015) for the roads proposed from conventional design and where the load of the aggregate is high. Such roads should be identified by NRIDA & SRRDA and suitable cost reduction measures should be proposed.

iii) During Pre-EC, state was asked to analyze the cost pattern of outlier roads under FDR where

- a. average total cost of 3.75 m is higher
- b. average total cost of 5.5 m wide roads is higher
- c. average total cost of 5.5 m wide roads is higher in multiple of 3.75 m wide roads.

State mentioned that they have revised the provisions of DPR under FDR and now the average cost has been reduced and updated on OMMAS.

11. **Maintenance**

i) State needs to include 5 years maintenance cost after 6th year's renewal in the DPRs.

ii) It was observed that 115 (8%) of the total packages are pending for locking. 166 (10%) of the total packages are pending for MEE. 64 (3%) roads are pending for registration on eMARG app. 1,237 (60%) roads are pending for Routine Inspection (RI). 1,685 (82%) roads are pending for Performance Evaluation (PE). 423 (28%) packages are pending for payment for more than 12 months. State was asked to do the Routine Inspection and Performance Evaluation regularly and improve the figures.

iii) State needs to update the data of Renewal length status and maintenance abstract.

12. **R&D Proposals**

i) State mentioned that they have proposed 100% surface dressing for roads of category T5 and less. However, the same is not shown on OMMAS. State was asked to look into it.

ii) As per cabinet approval, 50% roads of the total proposal under new technology should be constructed using waste plastic. However, it was seen that, the same is not being fulfilled in the current batch of proposals of the state. State has provisioned waste plastic for only 5% roads. Since, waste plastics are easily available in the state of Uttar Pradesh plus the roads constructed using waste plastics are very good in quality. Hence, the state was advised to propose atleast 2- 3000 km roads for construction using waste plastic in the BT layer.

iii) State was further requested to employ Self Help Groups for arrangement of plastic materials to be used in construction of roads.

iv) A discussion on use of IRC accredited/ non-accredited materials was held. The extracts are as under-

- a. As per the PMGSY guidelines 2013-14 on new technology, only IRC accredited products will be used in the PMGSY. However, a small clause was added which allows the use of non- accredited materials for a stretch of half a km and not on full length. It was supposed to be on trial basis, so any damage if occurs would be for half a km length only.

- b. IRC brought SP 89 in 2018 which covers all the category of stabilizers. It says that whichever material satisfies the requirement of the guidelines can be used by the user. It does not compel that the material should be accredited by IRC. However, the user should check the material characteristics and other things including the test reports from expert institutes.
- c. The new technology guidelines of PMGSY are still the same. But after the IRC:SP:89-2018 , that bar of keeping the use of accredited material only doesn't hold good. Committee also observed that Ministry's guidelines are inconsistent with the IRC:SP:89-2018 and IRC:SP:89 should prevail. At the same time, NRIDA needs to have clear cut policy to ensure the quality of the materials.
- d. Committee suggested that drawing MoU should depend upon the choice of SRRDA. If SRRDA choose to go with the accredited technology, then signing of the MoU is discretionary. If they choose to go with the non-accredited technology, MoU must be drawn. And if in such a case, MoU is not drawn by the state, the project should be declared null and void and the responsibility of the expenditure remains with the state government.
- e. NRIDA was advised to work on evaluation of new materials and also a proper SOP needs to be framed by NRIDA in this regard.

13. Sanctioned, Completed, Balance and Unawarded works

- i) It was observed that 30 works of PMGSY-III are still un-awarded. The status of the same was asked from the state. State responded that, out of 30, 13 are to be dropped, 9 are of FDR technology and have been awarded, 6 are being uploaded and 1 road is to be re-tendered.
- ii) The roads sanctioned in the previous batch of proposals of PMGSY-III are being dropped. The reason for the same was asked from the state. State replied that it is because the same roads were sanctioned under PWD also. State was advised to improve the coordination between SRRDA and PWD to save on time and cost of effort.

14. Physical Progress (2021-22)

- i) Annual physical target of the state for FY 2021-22 is 5000 km, out of which only 164 km has been constructed so far. State was advised to utilize the working season increase the pace of construction. State ensured to do the same.

15. Quality Issues

- i) Out of 869 packages, lab has not yet been established in respect of 48 packages. State needs to work on that.
- ii) 16 works have not been inspected by SQM even once, out of which 9 works are more than 12 months old. State should look into it.
- iii) State was directed to analyze the quality issues of RED and PWD separately. NRIDA should put it up in one month.
- iv) It was observed that, Unsatisfactory grading in NQM inspections is more in completed works, while it is comparatively very less in ongoing works. Committee suggested that NQMs should be sensitized with this issue. State was also asked to look into this aspect.

v) Various anomalies in respect of SQM inspections have been seen which are as follows-

- a. Size of information sign boards have not been found as per MoRD specifications (UP43145, UP67146).
- b. Images have not been uploaded in many packages. Also, no proof of tests conducted at site (UP0185- Inspection date 24-02-2021, UP0175- Inspection date 24-02-2021, UP03176- Inspection date 20-07-2021, UP03150- Inspection date 22-01-2021) was found.
- c. Volumetric analysis has been carried out using tin boxes instead wooden box of standard size (UP4190, UP63147, UP67146).
- d. Pit of standard size (50*50 cm²) has not been excavated (UP0195, UP57136).
- e. For thickness of Premix Carpet, cake is excavated and thickness of this cake is measured separately which is wrong procedure of checking thickness of PMC (UP09130, UP09126).
- f. 1060 Inspections have been conducted by SQMs during 2021-22. Out of these inspections, pdf reports of only 371 have been uploaded.

16. **Complaints – Response awaited, which need to be expedited**

- i) PMGSY Poor and Third Quality Work by the Department and Contractor at Village-Gahani, Police station-Haldharpur, Block-Ratanpura, Distt-Mau, Uttar Pradesh – Shri Ram Prakash Singh, New Delhi-110045
- ii) Non Responsive of bid in Package no. UP07120 by M/s Raj Constructions, Kasganj – Shri M/s R. H. Constructions, Badaun, UP
- iii) Issue for incomplete of road at a crossing - Shri Rohan Patel (Prayagraj)
- iv) PMGSY केअन्तर्गतग्राम-इटौरा, ब्लाक-रतनपूरा, जिला-मऊ, में सड़क का निर्माण किया गया था, जिसकी गुणवत्ता थर्ड क्लास में हुई है, एवं पूरी तरह खराब एवं टूट गई हैं - Ram Prakash Singh, New Delhi
- v) For tendering - UP44/06R, UP44/07R, UP44/08R and UP44/09R – Shri Vivek Kumar, New Basti, Lakhimpur(UP)
- vi) For cancellation of Pkg No. UP07117 (M/s. Prem Constructions, Sole Proprietor) – M/s Srikrishna and Company, Ghazaibad
- vii) Requesting Maintenance for Road, Rural Area development. – Shri HIMANSHU JOSHI, Loni.
- viii) Package no UP 63135 tender id 2021 uprrd 108237 bid no 462276- Shri Shri Sanjeev Chauhan, Sri Balaji Builders
- ix) Irregularities in tendering of PMGSY works in Muzzafarnagar, Saharanpur, Shamli and Meerut District –Shri Charan Singh

17. **Financial issues**

- i) Interest recovery amounting of Rs. 15.28 Cr. is pending from Bank.
- ii) State has submitted incomplete PMGSY financial reconciliation report
- iii) Incorrect State budget is being shown on PFMS TSRY-07 report.

State was asked to look into these financial issues and take appropriate action.

Subject to the above observations and concurrent action/compliance by the State Government as stipulated in the foregoing paras, the Empowered Committee recommended the above proposals as at Para-2 above.

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