

File No-P.17024/15/2024-RC (FMS-386916)

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

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 15th January, 2024

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Subject: Minutes of the Meeting of Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State of Madhya Pradesh under PM-JANMAN, Batch-I of 2023-24 -reg.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the Meeting of the Empowered Committee held on **11th January, 2024 at 3:30 PM** onwards under the Chairmanship of Secretary (RD) through video conferencing (VC).

2. State is requested to furnish the Compliance Report on the observations made during the EC Meeting on time for sanctioning the projects under PM-JANMANN.


(K.M Singh)
Director (RC)
Tel: 011-23070308

Distribution:

- i. Principal Secretary, Panchayat & Rural Development Department, Govt. of Madhya Pradesh Email: psprd@mp.gov.in
- ii. CEO, M.P. Rural Road Development Agency Block-2 Floor-5, Parayawas Bhawan Bhopal. Email: ceomprda@gmail.com
- iii. Secretary, Ministry of Tribal Affairs, 1st Floor, Jeewan Tara Building, Sansad Marg, Patel Chowk, New Delhi.
- iv. Sh. Naval Jit Kapoor, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Tribal Affairs, 1st Floor, Jeewan Tara Building, Sansad Marg, Patel Chowk, New Delhi.
- v. Sh. Biswajit Das, DDG, Ministry of Tribal Affairs, 1st Floor, Jeewan Tara Building, Sansad Marg, Patel Chowk, New Delhi.
- vi. The Advisor (TPT), NITI Aayog, Yojana Bhavan, New Delhi.
- vii. The Director, Central Roads Research Institute, Mathura Road, New Delhi.

Copy to:-

PSO to Secretary (RD) /PPS to JS&FA /PPS to JS (RC)/All Directors in NRIDA, New Delhi

Minutes of the Meeting of the Empowered Committee held on 11th January, 2024 to consider the Project Proposal submitted by Government of Madhya Pradesh under PM JANMAN, Batch- I, 2023-24.

A Meeting of the Empowered Committee was held on 11th January, 2024 under the Chairmanship of Secretary, Rural Development to discuss the project proposal **submitted by the State of Madhya Pradesh** under PM-JANMAN, Batch I of 2023-24. The following Officers were present in the meeting:

Representatives from Government of India	
Shri Shailesh Kumar Singh	Secretary, Rural Development, GoI
Ms. Tanuja Thakur Khalkho	Joint Secretary & Financial Adviser (MoRD)
Shri Amit Shukla	Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA
Shri K.M. Singh	Director (RC)
Shri Rajeev Rana	Under Secretary (RC)
Shri Pradeep Agarwal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
Ms. Shalini Das	Joint Director(Tech)
Shri Vishal Srivastava	Joint Director ICT
Shri B.C Pradhan	Dir (consultant) , Tech , NRIDA
Shri I.K.Pateriya	Dir (consultant) , Quality, NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Aggarwal	Dir(P.1), NRIDA
Sh. Satyendra Chadha	Director, MoTA
Representatives from Government of Madhya Pradesh	
Sh. Manu Shrivastava	Additional Chief Secretary
Ms. Tanvi Sundriyal	CEO, MPRRDA
Shri M.L Dabar	E-in-C, MPRRDA
Shri S D Pendse	CGM, MPRRDA
Shri Govind Pancholi	ITNO, MPRRDA

2. The details of the proposal of the State Govt. under PM-JANMAN, Batch I of 2023-24 are as under: -

Item	As per Pre EC dated 09.01.2024				As per OMMAS dated 11.01.2024			
	No	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)
Roads	128	343.74	290.23	84.35	128	343.74 km	290.23	84.43
Total	128	343.74	290.23	84.35	128	343.74	290.23	84.43

Central share:- 170.98 Cr.

State Share:- 119.24 Cr.

7 roads having 3.00 m width – 71.75 km - Rs. 107.20 Lakhs/km

121 roads having 3.75 m width – 271.99 km - Rs. 78.43 Lakhs/km

All the road proposals have been duly scrutinized by STA. 13 proposals (10.15%) scrutinized by PTA on OMMAS.

District wise habitations abstract

N o.	District	Habitati on Unco nnected As per MOTA List	Habitati ons Unc onnecte d As per MOTA List (Le ss than 100) < 1 00 Popu lation	Habitati ons Unc onnecte d As per MOTA List Mo re than 100 Pop ulation	Eligible Habita tion Un connect ed	Not C lear i n List Prov ided by M oTA	Already Connected Through							Road Proposed	
							PMGSY	PWD/ Other State Govt.	Deem ed to be Co nnect ed by PMG SY	Not Fe asible Due to Forest Issues	Land No t Availa ble	Total (6to1 1)	Benefited	No. of Road	Length
1	Anuppur	35	1	34	26	0	3	3	0	0	2	8	26	14	29.39
2	Ashok Nagar	4	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2.56
3	Balaghat	31	0	31	10	0	19	2	0	0	0	21	10	11	38.41
4	Chhindwara	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	Datia	3	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0		1	2	2	2.4
6	Dindori	38	2	36	32	1	1	2	0	0	0	4	32	20	47.73
7	Guna	11	0	11	4	1	3	1	0	0	0	5	6	4	11.26
8	Gwalior	29	2	27	8	0	2	17	0	0	0	19	8	10	14.87
10	Mandla	21	1	20	17	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	17	14	37.01
11	Morena	2	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	2.1
12	Narsinghpur	8	0	8	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	61.1
13	Satna	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2.85
14	Shahdol	44	1	43	36	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	36	23	38.52
15	Sheopur	2	0	2	2		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	5.36
16	Shivpuri	31	0	31	7	0	14	10	0	0	0	24	7	6	23.32
17	Sidhi	15	0	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	13	27.46
	TOTAL	276	8	268	170	6	49	39	0	0	2	96	172	128	344.34

General Observations:

It was informed that in the initial list of 2954 habitations provided by MoTA, 276 were mentioned as unconnected in the State. Further, 8 habitations out of 276 have less than 100 population. Out of the balance 268 eligible habitations, 49 were verified by the States as already connected by PMGSY roads and 39 by PWD/ other State roads and 2 roads have land issues. **State apprised the EC that it had accordingly proposed 128 roads for coverage of 128 habitations. LSBs will be proposed in the next batch. State also informed that some more proposals will be submitted in the next batch as per further lists brought out by MoTA.**

Representative of MoTA told that whatever habitations state needs to propose, the same should be reflected on PM Gati Shakti portal.

EC requested the State to share the reasons for proposing 7 roads with lesser 3 meter carriage-way width and lesser 6m roadway width. The State representative informed the EC that 6 roads are lying in dense forest areas and 1 road has private-land issues and due to the land availability problems these road specifications have been proposed. The EC, noting that this is establishment of initial connectivity to the habitations, agreed to this submission. A total of 5 of these roads are in Narsinghpur district.

3. Planning Audit (Proposals)

- Out of 121 road proposals, 98 have been successfully uploaded by state onto Geo Sadak . State was asked to upload the balance proposals quickly.
- NRIDA has audited 61 proposals on GeoSadak. NRIDA was advised to do the planning audit of the balance habitations and give their recommendations to State for compliance and bring the observations at the time of submitting the compliance report.
- One proposal of State namely package no MP 37PMJM001 was found to be unsatisfactory. State was advised to revisit it and get it corrected as proposed habitation already seems to be connected with PMGSY-1 Road.

4. Length wise proposal details:

Length-wise details of proposal are as follows:

Length wise proposal details						
Length of road (in km)	Nos.	Length in km	Pavement cost crores	Avg Pav Cost/km	Total cost in crores	Avg total cost/km
0 – 1	25	19.49	11.09	56.89	15.69	80.50
1 - 2	38	60.10	33.81	56.25	48.72	81.07
2 – 3	35	84.01	48.30	57.49	67.33	80.15
3 – 4	16	55.37	31.07	56.11	42.67	77.06
4 – 5	5	23.95	13.22	55.19	18.33	76.55
Above 5	9	100.82	60.68	60.19	97.48	96.68
Total	128	343.74	198.16	57.65	290.23	84.43

5. Distribution of roads based on Traffic Category:-

(i) All the 7 roads of 3 meter width is of T4 category

(ii) Balance 121 roads is of 3.75 meter width. Out of it 11 roads are of T4 category, 8 roads in T5 category and 2 roads in T9 category.

State was requested to re-examine 2 roads of T9 category having average cost/km more than Rs.98.02 lakh. It was also decided to send the team of NRIDA to make on the spot assessment of these roads.

6. District wise details of proposals :

It was seen that in 3 meter width category 1 road of Balaghat district and 5 roads of Narsinghpur districts have high non pavement cost. State informed that all these roads are lying in hilly terrain and lot of CD works and protection works are needed to ensure that the roads do not get damaged in the rainy season. Also 2 roads of Ashok Nagar, 4 roads of Gunna and one road of Shivpur have high non- pavement cost. All such roads to be examined by NRIDA by field verification.

7. (i) Pavement cost/km wise details:

The details of proposals are as under:-

Pavement cost/ km wise details			
SI No	Pavement cost/km	No of roads	
		3 m	3.75
1	Less than 60	5	91
2	60-82	2	30
	Total	7	121

State was asked to furnish proper justification with regard to higher pavement cost more than 70 lakh. Tech Division, NRIDA was also asked to examine the high pavement cost of these roads and rationalize the same wherever feasible .

(ii) Non pavement cost/km wise details:

The details of proposals are as under:

Non Pavement cost/ km wise details			
SI No	Non Pavement cost/km	No of roads	
		3 m	3.75 m
1	Less than 20	1	52
4	40-58	6	69
	Total	7	121

Tech Division, NRIDA was asked to examine the high non-pavement costs of these 75 (=6+69) roads and rationalize the same wherever feasible.

8. DPR Compliance :

SI No.	Observations	Compliance	NRIDA Comments, State submission during EC and observations of EC
1.	The state needs to propose 20mm MSS in place of 20 mm OGPC.	State has no practical experience of execution of MSS in field. These works are located in the very remote areas and typical topography; as such it will not be feasible for the state to execute it in such far flung remote places. In view of this, as per discussion in pre EC held on 09.01.2024, the State may be allow to use conventional OGPC+Seal Coat on these roads.	<p>Tech Division NRIDA observed that State should try for 20 mm MSS in 1-2 roads to get exposure of this surfacing method. Compliance of this to be submitted after EC.</p> <p>The State requested for consideration of OGPC technology in place of 20 mm MSS as they have been implementing this technology for last many years and have gained ample experience in implementation of this technology. Also MSS required proper monitoring and all these roads being in interior areas such monitoring will be difficult. This will result in quality compromise which State wanted to avoid.</p> <p>State was explained the benefit of MSS both by DG, NRIDA & JS(RC) and Dir(Consultant), Tech, NRIDA. It was also explained that process for laying roads with these two technologies are identical and the same degree of monitoring is needed for MSS as for OGPC. It was also explained that MSS is considered as better technology than OGPC where the chance of water percolation is less in comparison to OGPC which is an open graded technology. Also as per the Vision Documents on New Technology-2022, it is mandatory to use new technology in PMGSY roads and state should take this technology as other states are also taking this technology.</p> <p>State representatives again apprised the EC that OGPC technooogy had stabilised in the State and they may be allowed to proceed with the technology. The State agreed to propose some part of the proposal for MSS technology on pilot basis. It also agreed to ensure quality of execution of OGPC works through stringent supervision and these works are to be executed through hot-mix plants and pavers ; prohibition of manual</p>

SI No.	Observations	Compliance	NRIDA Comments, State submission during EC and observations of EC
			laying is to monitored. Keeping in view the submission by the State and the need for quick execution, the EC agreed to the proposal.
2.	Hard shoulder needs to be proposed for 100mm thickness and 1m wide on both sides same needs to be corrected on DPR.	The issue has been discussed in detail during the EC and it was explained that from point of structural stability of pavement, good hard shoulders are essential. In addition from road safety aspects also adequate width and depth of hard shoulder is a must. The insistence on 1.0 m width hard shoulder and remaining width in earthen shoulder involves practical consideration of execution of work at site. In view of this the EC may reconsider and allow the state for 1.875mtrs.	The submission was agreed by the EC provided the material was of the required specification.
3.	Utility shifting needs to be taken under higher specifications head.	Already taken under higher specification cost.	Agreed
4.	State has taken large lengths of CC roads. CC roads should be limited to habitation areas only.	Some of the roads involve extremely steep gradients, in forest areas with high rainfall, where flexible pavements are likely to be damaged in rainy seasons. Hence CC Pavements are proposed in more length may be consider further it is to clarify that out of total length 344.33 km CC length 82.38 km is 23.92 percentage also be have reason for that verified by the respective PIUs in Narsingpur District.	Site visit had been arranged for ground verification.
5.	Instead of plain CC roads, state is advised to adopt panelled cement concrete technology.	As submitted in point number one, the State may be allowed to execute plain CC roads only.	State should propose some length with panelled cement concrete.
6.	State has taken large lengths of CC drains. CC drains should be limited to habitation areas only.	CC drains are being taken only in habitation areas or as per technical requirement at the fields.	Site visit report would be considered for assessing actual ground condition.
7.	There are few roads with T9 category. State needs to provide ATCC survey report.	There are only two roads having T-9 category traffic. Instructions are being issued for carrying ATCC survey on these roads.	As ATCC report not submitted, it should be added in clearance condition.

9. Other observations and decisions:

- The State submitted that any costs over and above Rs. 1 Cr/ Km ceiling will be borne by the State.
- **State also agreed to use waste plastic for these roads under new technology.**
- State needs to submit the ATCC report for proposals above 1 MSA to NRIDA.
- **State has provided rigid pavement in large lengths. The State responded that certain sites have stream flows which require rigid pavement for preventing damage to the pavement. State was requested to re-examine the requirements around habitation areas.**
- Cement concrete pavement was proposed of 7.5 m width and 200 mm thickness, it is to be paneled cement concrete of 100mm/ 120 mm thickness for rationalizing the costs. **State agreed to construct some roads under Panelled Cement Concrete in place of plain CC roads.**
- Cost of utility shifting should be taken under higher specification head.
- **It was also explained to State that cost of road including the cost of bridge on the same road should not be more than 1 crore per km and in case it exceeds as the bridges proposals have not yet come , State shall bear the cost above 1 crore/ Km and if required they may submit the proposal to High Power Committee for sanction of cost over 1 crore/ km.**

State was requested to furnish the inputs on priority.

10. Maintenance

State has proposed Rs. 11.46 lakh for 5 years Routine maintenance, which is 3.95 % of the construction cost, which is on the lower side. Similarly, for 6th year renewal cost is Rs. 23.33 lakh, which is of 8.03% of the construction cost, which is on the lower side. **The State was requested to re-examine it.**

11. Empowered Committee asked the State to send the compliance on all the observations mentioned in the foregoing paras so that proposals could be sanctioned at the earliest.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to and from the Chair.
