


**MINUTES**

**Subject: Meeting of Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the Government of UT of Ladakh for the year 2022-23 (Batch-I) – reg.**

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Minutes of the Empowered Committee meeting held on **3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2023 at 2:00 PM (through VC)** under the Chairmanship of Secretary (RD) to discuss the project proposals of UT of Ladakh for the Batch-I ( year 2022-23 ) of PMGSY-III.

2. UT is requested to furnish the compliance to the observations contained in the minutes to the Ministry/NRIDA at the earliest for clearance of the project on time.

  
(K.M. Singh)  
Director (RC)

**Distribution:**

- i. Commissioner/ Secretary, PWD (R&B) Cum CEO (LRRDA), UT Secretariat, Leh-Ladakh- 194101
- ii. Chief Engineer PW (R&B)/ PMGSY, Secretariat Complex, UT of Ladakh- 194401
- iii. The Adviser (RD), NITI Aayog, NITI Aayog Bhavan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.
- iv. The Director, Central Roads Research Institute, Mathura Road, New Delhi.
- v. The Secretary General, Indian Road Congress, Kama Koti Marg, Ranjit Nagar, Sector-6, Rama Krishna Puram, New Delhi-110037
- vi. The Chief Engineer, Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, Parivahan Bhavan, New Delhi.
- vii. All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110001.

**Copy for information to:-**

PS to Hon'ble MRD/ PS to Hon'ble MoS (RD)/ PSO 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 3<sup>RD</sup> MARCH, 2023 AT 2:00 P.M. TO CONSIDER PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY UT OF LADAKH UNDER PMGSY-III, BATCH I, 2022-23**

A Meeting of the Empowered Committee was held through Video Conference on **3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2023 at 2:00 PM** under the Chairmanship of Secretary (RD) to consider the project proposals submitted by the UT of Ladakh under PMGSY-III, Batch-I of 2022-23. Following officials were present in the meeting.

<b>MoRD/ NRIDA Representatives</b>	
Shri Shailesh Kumar Singh	Secretary (RD)
Shri Khilli Ram Meena	AS & FA (RD)
Dr. Ashish Kumar Goel	Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA
Shri Amit Shukla	Joint Secretary (RC)
Shri Mam Chand	Director (IFD), MoRD
Shri K.M. Singh	Director(RC), MoRD
Ms. Anjali Yadav	Assistant Director (RC), MoRD
Shri. B C Pradhan	Consultant Director (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Nirmal Bhagat	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Dr. I.K. Pateriya	Director (P.III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agarwal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
<b>UT Representatives</b>	
Sh. Ajeet Kumar Sahu	Commissioner/Secretary, PW (R&B)/PMGSY, Ladakh
Sh. Tashi Chombel	Chief Engineer, PW (R&B)/PMGSY, Ladakh
Sh. Gulam Nabi Zargar	Superintendent, PMGSY, Ladakh

## 2. Details of Proposal

As per Pre EC dated 21.12.2021					As per OMMAS as on 01.03.2023			
Item	Nos	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)	Nos	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)
Roads	50	425.64	538.28	126.50*	50	418.365	438.46	104.8**
LSBs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>50 roads</b>	<b>425.64 km roads m LSBs</b>	<b>538.28</b>	<b>126.5</b>	<b>50 roads</b>	<b>418.365km roads</b>	<b>438.46</b>	<b>104.8</b>

\* With 12%GST

\*\* With 18%GST

MoRD Share : Rs. 438.47 Crores

UT Share : Rs. 0 Crores

## 3. General Observations

- i) The UT of Ladakh has been allocated target of 500 km under PMGSY-III. This is the first batch of proposals submitted by the UT.
- ii) 7 roads of 56.6 km are proposed for 3 m carriageway width at an average cost of Rs. 92.24 lakhs/Km and 43 roads of 361.8 km are proposed for 3.75 m carriageway width at an average cost of Rs 106.8 lakhs/km.
- iii) Total cost at the time of Pre-EC was Rs. 538.28 crore and average cost was Rs. 126.50 lakh/ km with 12% GST. After the visit of team from National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency(NRIDA), which properly scrutinised the Detailed Project Reports(DPRs) prepared by the UT and rationalised the specifications as per the recommendations of the technical committee constituted by NRIDA, the total cost has significantly come down to Rs. 438.46 crore and the average cost is now Rs. 104.8 lakh/ km despite GST being increased by 6% and despite increase in SoR.

UT had earlier proposed to adopt IRC specifications meant for snow bound area; these are however applicable for areas with heavy traffic. On the advice of the Ministry, UT has agreed to adopt new technologies like cement treated base/Cement Grouted Bituminous Mix(CGBM) etc. as per the recommendations of the technical committee which was constituted on 23<sup>rd</sup> September, 2022 by NRIDA to study the traffic, soil strata, climatic situation and any other parameters and suggest probable design solution for construction of durable roads with optimum cost in the UT.

iv) All proposals have been uploaded on Online Management, Monitoring and Accounting System(OMMAS) and scrutinized by State Technical Agency(STA). Principal Technical Agency(PTA) has also scrutinised 5 roads.

#### **4. Average Cost**

i) The average cost of the works sanctioned to the UT under PMGSY-I in 2018-19 was Rs. 93.8 lakh/ km. For works sanctioned under PMGSY-II in 2019-20, the average cost was Rs. 109.07 lakh/ km. For the current batch of proposals, in pre-EC, the cost was Rs. 126.5 lakh/ km for 3.75 m wide roads. During the EC meeting, it has been reduced to Rs. 106.8 lakh/ km for 3.75 m wide roads and Rs. 92.24 lakh/ km for 3 m wide roads.

#### **5. Planning Audit**

i) All 50 roads have been uploaded on GEOSADAK and audited by NRIDA for their utility as Through Route(TR)/ Major Rural Link (MRL).

ii) Only 8 roads of the proposals have more than 75% BT/ CC surface. These roads were constructed by PWD, which did not do the black topping. Other roads have less than 75% BT/CC surface. It was informed by the UT that since there are no other eligible roads in the UT, hence considering the peculiar situation of the UT, being a border area and inherent lack of roads and all other major roads being taken over by BRO, these roads are being considered as a special case.

i) 34 roads have less than 25% BT/ CC surface.

#### **7. Pre-EC Compliance**

i. It was observed during Pre-EC that one road in Kargil district (MRL07-Sankoo-Itchoo Road KM 16th RD 600 M to Theela, TheelaBroq) had 100% non BT/CC surface. Since this road is benefitting habitations of population 271, the team sent to Ladakh suggested another pavement composition for the road. UT has now adopted the same and the cost has been revised.

ii. It was observed during Pre-EC that a road in Kargil district (MRL15-KS Road KM 24th RD 600M to Marpodoks) had 100%non BT/CC surface and UT had proposed 100% new construction for the same. UT clarified that the road is not new construction, it was earlier constructed by PWD. Also, although the road is parallel to a BT road but there is no access to this habitation due to defence installation in between the space. Hence, the road is important. The

team sent to Ladakh recommended Cement Treated Base(CTB) for this road, and UT adopted the same.

iii. During Pre-EC, UT had proposed 28 roads with 3 m carriageway width, now in EC meeting, UT has reduced this number to 7. Other roads are proposed with 3.75 m carriageway width. However, the traffic on these 28 roads is very less. Committee asked the UT about the difficulty to retain all 28 roads in 3 m category. UT representative mentioned that, during snow fall the road width gets reduced. Also due to road safety reasons, sometimes crash barriers are put, which also reduces the width of the road. Committee agreed to the justifications given by the UT and considering the facts that codes suggest minimum width of road to be 3.5 to 3.75 m and also, the cost after adoption of new technology is less than the one proposed earlier with 3 m carriageway width.

#### **8. Length-wise proposal details**

i. It was observed that, of the proposed roads, 4 roads are of 3 to 5 km and 46 roads are of more than 5 km. UT representative clarified that, 4 roads are of exactly 5 km.

#### **9. Distribution of Roads based on Traffic Category**

i. 7 roads proposed of 3 m width and 19 roads of 3.75 m width is of T3 traffic category. 24 roads of 3.75 m width is of T4 traffic category.

#### **10. PCU/ day details**

i. PCU of the 7 roads of 3 m and 42 roads of 3.75 m is less than 500. PCU of 1 road of 3.75 m is between 500 to 1000.

#### **11. Distribution of Roads based on widening to various Carriageway**

i. 7 roads have been proposed for upgradation from 3 m to 3 m and the rest 43 roads have been proposed for widening and upgradation from 3 m to 3.75 m.

#### **12. Average cost trends vis-a-vis other states**

It was observed that, the average cost/ km in the UT of Ladakh is Rs. 104. 8 lakh/ km, which is an outlier in respect of average cost sanctioned to other states under PMGSY-III. UT representative mentioned that the SoR of CPWD is 17% higher in Ladakh. Also the non-pavement cost increases in the hilly areas due to the provisions of protection works etc.

#### **13. District-wise details of the current proposal**

i. It was observed that, the pavement cost in both Kargil and Ladakh has reduced after Pre-EC meeting. Pavement cost in Kargil district was Rs. 83.07 lakh/ km, which has been reduced to Rs. 64.51 lakh/ km in the EC meeting. Similarly, the pavement cost in Leh district was Rs. 80.69 lakh/ km in Pre-EC and the same has been reduced to Rs. 56.69 lakh/ km in EC meeting.

#### **14. Pavement and Non-Pavement cost/ km wise details**

- i. It was observed that, of the 43 roads in 3.75 m width category, 19 roads have pavement cost of more than Rs. 60 lakh/ km. Reason for the same was asked from NRIDA. NRIDA mentioned that due to excessive cutting in the hillside, cost has increased in these roads.
- ii. It was observed that, of the 43 roads in 3.75 m width category, 25 roads have non-pavement cost of more than Rs. 45 lakh/ km. NRIDA mentioned that, this is because the roads are new and provision of protection works and crash barriers have been provided.

#### **15. R&D Proposals**

- i. In all the roads except 4 roads, provision of cement stabilization followed with 25 mm SDBC has been made in 384.42 km road length (91.88%). In 4 roads, the cement stabilization was not feasible, hence WBM has been provisioned.
- ii. In top layer, CGBM has been provisioned in 46.94 km road length (11.19%).
- iii. **Since, UT is going to use cement stabilization and CGBM for the first time, UT was asked to train their engineers and contractors in coordination with NRIDA. Experts shall be deputed from NRIDA PTA/ STA and other institutes to the UT to handhold the engineers and contractors regularly.**
- iv. UT asked, if 3-4 roads can be merged to form a single package while tendering. Committee mentioned that forming suitable packages for tendering is the choice of the state/UT and they are at a liberty to do so.
- v. **Committee suggested the UT to conduct a test patch of 100 m for each road to do the strength and durability testing. Once the strength and durability comes out to be satisfactory, UT may complete the entire road. Committee emphasised that applying the technology in correct way is an important aspect as even good technologies may fail if not executed properly.**
- vi. UT requested that, a workshop to train the engineers may be conducted in March, as, the working season will start after that and all the engineers, contractors will get engaged. UT also requested for a small demonstration project of 100-200 m during the above workshop. UT asked if the experts may suggest, if using admixtures would work, as it helps setting up the mixture in lower temperature also. Committee agreed to the requests of the UT. It was decided to hold workshop in March or early April.

#### **16. Physical Progress**

- i. 15 roads of 78 km are balance to be constructed under PMGSY-I & II in the UT. UT assured to complete the works in working season this year i.e. May to October.

**17. Financial Issues**

- i. Audited Balance Sheets of Administrative Expenses Fund & Maintenance Fund for FY 2021-22 have not yet been submitted. UT was asked to submit the same at the earliest.
- ii. Interest Verification calculation with Bank has not been submitted. UT was asked to submit the same at the earliest.
- iii. Financial Reconciliation of Fund Released & Expenditure incurred has not been submitted. UT was asked to submit the same at the earliest.
- iv. 01 work is pending for financial closure for more than 180 days as on 02-03-2023. UT was asked to financially close this work.
- v. Releases are not being shown in TRSY 07 report of PFMS. UT was asked to resolve this issue.
- vi. An amount of Rs. 36.66 crore is pending to be released in SNA. UT was asked to get this amount credited from state treasury to SNA.

It was decided by the Empowered Committee that since no compliance is pending from UT, the sanction of the proposal can be processed straightway.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to and from the Chair.

\*\*\*\*\*