

No.H-17024/27/2024-RC (FMS No. 387345)

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

KrishiBhavan, New Delhi  
Dated the 11<sup>th</sup> March, 2024

**OFFICE MEMORANDUM**

**Subject: Minutes of Empowered Committee meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> February, 2024 to consider the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Tripura under PM JANMAN (Batch-I, 2023-24) -reg.**

The undersigned is directed to forward herewith minutes of the Empowered Committee meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> February, 2024 under the Chairmanship of Secretary (Rural Development) to consider the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Tripura under PM JANMAN (Batch-I, 2023-24).

2. State Government is requested to furnish compliance on all the observations of EC on priority.

Encl: As above.

(Timan Singh)  
Deputy Director (RC)

To:

- I. The Secretary, Public Works Department, Government of Tripura
- II. Chief Engineer & Empowered Officer, Tripura Rural Road Development Agency (TRRDA)
- III. Shri Vibhu Nayar, Secretary, Ministry of Tribal Affairs, 1st Floor, Jeewan Tara Building, Sansad Marg, Patel Chowk, New Delhi.
- IV. All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5th Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110001

Copy to:-

- PSO to Secretary (RD)
- PPS to JS&FA
- PPS to JS (RC)

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Empowered Committee held on 16<sup>th</sup> February, 2024 to consider the Project Proposal submitted by Government of Tripura under PM-JANMAN, Batch- I, 2023-24**

A Meeting of the Empowered Committee was held on 16<sup>th</sup> February, 2024 at 04:00 PM under the Chairmanship of Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of India to discuss the project proposal submitted by the State of Tripura under PM-JANMAN, Batch-I of 2023-24. The following Officers were present in the meeting:

<b>Representative from Government of India</b>	
Shri Shailesh Kumar Singh	Secretary, Rural Development, MoRD
Mrs Tanuja Thakur Khalkho	Joint Secretary & Financial Adviser, MoRD
Shri Amit Shukla	Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA
Shri Devinder Kumar	Director (RC)
Shri Satyendra	Director, MoTA
Shri Timan Singh	Deputy Director (RC)
Shri B C Pradhan	Consultant Director (Tech.), NRIDA
Mrs. Shalini Das	Joint Director (Tech.), NRIDA
Shri Vishal Srivastava	Consultant (ICT), NRIDA
<b>Representatives from Government of Tripura</b>	
Mr. K. Gitte, IAS	Secretary, PWD, Govt of Tripura
Mr. Bimal Das	Chief Engineer cum Empowered Officer, TRRDA
Mr. N. K. Chakma	SQC, TRRDA
Mr. S. Das	SE, TRRDA
Mr. S. H. Jamatia	ITNO, TRRDA
Mr. Sudip Chakraborty	EE, TRRDA
Mr. S. Bardhan	FC, TRRDA

## **2. Details of Current Proposal**

A detailed presentation on the proposal submitted by the State of Tripura under Batch-I of 2023-24 was made by Joint Secretary (RC) and DG NRIDA before the Empowered Committee (EC). The details of the proposal are as under:

<b>Item</b>	<b>As per PRE-EC</b>				<b>As per OMMAS dated 16.02.2024</b>			
	<b>No</b>	<b>Length (in km/m)</b>	<b>Cost (Rs in Crores)</b>	<b>Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Length (in km/m)</b>	<b>Cost (Rs in Crores)</b>	<b>Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)</b>
<b>Roads</b>	26	<b>73.85</b>	114.64	155.23	42	120.554	115.90	96.14

Total	26 roads	73.85 km Roads	114.64	155.23	42 roads	120.554	115.90	96.14
Central share: - 104.31 Crore					State Share: - 11.59 Crore			

### 3. General Observations

- i. All the road proposals have been duly scrutinized by STA and PTA scrutiny is yet to be done. State was requested to ensure PTA scrutiny on priority.
- ii. The current batch of proposals is for 42 road works of 120.554 km length in 3.75 m carriageway width category with average cost of Rs. 96.14 lakh/km.
- iii. As per MoTA list, total 150 eligible habitations are to be connected in the State out of which State has verified that 48 are of less than 100 population, 17 are not clear in the list and 17 are connected through PMGSY/ State schemes.
- iv. *Some of the proposals checked on OMMAS were found to be less than 100 population (e.g. PKG-TR0305-P4) in the current Batch.* State was requested to re-verify the eligibility as per population criteria for all the proposals and confirm. State should also confirm the list of habitations to be connected from these 42 roads.
- v. During EC meeting, the IT Division, NRIDA informed that the habitations proposed to be connected under the instant proposal have been migrated from Geosadak to PM-Gatishakti portal. It was further informed that details of habitations, received from MoTA, in excel format have been entered in the OMMAS backend and DPR for only those habitations that are present in this list are allowed to be uploaded on OMMAS.
- vi. The representative of MoTA informed that the list provided by them had been downloaded from Gatishakti and this can also be downloaded by all users of the portal. ***EC advised NRIDA to re-confirm the list of proposed habitations from the list of habitations downloaded from Gatishakti portal.***
- vii. *It was observed by EC that average cost of 02 proposals is more than Rs. 1 crore/km. It was informed to the State that proposals of average cost more than Rs. 1 crore/km need to be either put up to High Empowered Committee or cost over and above Rs.1 crore/km need to borne by the State. State apprised EC that the cost over and above Rs. 1 crore/km will be core by the State.*
- viii. State apprised EC that current proposals had been formulated as per the SoR 2023 that had been vetted by NRIDA.
- ix. State was requested to submit the LSB proposals for these roads on priority, if any.

#### 4. Planning Audit (Proposals)

All 42 road proposals had been successfully uploaded to GeoSadak and ported on Gatishakti portal. NRIDA has audited all proposals on GeoSadak and justification of 12 proposals was yet to be received from State. State was requested to examine these proposals in consultation with NRIDA team and provide the proper justification on priority.

Details of 12 roads proposals are given below:

- i. **TR0622-P4:** Connectivity to the Habitation mentioned in the can be provided to the nearest PMGSY-I Road. The proposal for longer route is to be justified/ re-examined.
- ii. **TR0621-P4:** Already, habitation mentioned in the proposal appears to have connectivity. State was requested to re-examine the proposal.
- iii. **TR0618-P4:** Proposal for loop road had been submitted which is not allowed as it is sub-optimal and entails extra expenditure. Apart from from PVTG habitation mentioned in the proposal, other habitations are being connected.
- iv. **TR0620-P4:** The PVTG habitation lies within the 500-meter path distance of PMGSY-I, thus considered connected. It is also observed that apart from the PVTG habitation, other habitations are being connected which is to be re-examined..
- v. **TR0611 P4:** In this proposal a link has been proposed beyond the PVTG habitation which is to be re-examined.
- vi. **TR0604 P4:** The PVTG habitation lies within the 500-meter path distance of PMGSY-I, thus considered connected.
- vii. **TR0613 P4:** The PVTG habitation lies within the 500-meter path distance of PMGSY-I, thus considered connected.
- viii. **TR0615 P4:** The PVTG habitation lies within the 500-meter path distance of PMGSY-I, thus considered connected.
- ix. **TR0628-P4:** Apart from the PVTG habitation, other habitations are also being proposed for connectivity. The habitation also seems to have connectivity; State to re-examine the proposal.
- x. **TR0311-P4:** Apart from the PVTG habitation, other habitations are also being proposed for connectivity. The habitation also seems to have connectivity; State to re-examine the proposal.
- xi. **TR0313-P4:** It appears to be a standalone proposal; State needs to verify if all-weather connectivity is being provided.
- xii. **TR0502-P4:** Habitation mentioned in the proposal appears to have connectivity.

#### 5. Average cost trends

EC observed that average cost was Rs. 86.97 lakh/km and Rs. 115.23 lakh/ km at the time of sanction of roads under PMGSY-I in FY 2017-18 and at the time of Pre-EC respectively; now, it is Rs. 96.14 lakh/ km.

State informed that PMGSY-I sanction was accorded during 2017-18 based on SoR 2012 and for the current proposal SoR 2023 is being considered which is the main reason for increase in the average cost. The SoR 2023 had been vetted by NRIDA.

#### 6. Lengthwise proposal details

Length-wise details of proposal are as follows

Sl. No.	Items	No of roads	Length in km	Pavement cost in crores	Avg Pav Cost (Lakh/km)	Total cost in crores	Avg total cost (Lakh/km)
1	Less than 1 km	9	7.011	6.12	87.33	7.29	104.05
2	1-2 km	15	21.687	18.70	86.23	21.19	97.74
3	2-3 km	6	14.239	12.54	88.12	14.75	103.64
4	3-4 km	5	16.256	13.69	84.26	15.43	94.93
5	>=5km	7	61.361	52.78	86.02	57.22	93.26
<b>Total</b>		<b>42</b>	<b>120.554</b>	<b>103.85</b>	<b>86.14</b>	<b>115.90</b>	<b>96.14</b>

The State was requested to provide detailed justification for the higher average costs as mentioned in sl. no. 1 and 3 in above table. *State has apprised that additional costs above Rs. 1 crore/ km will be met from their own resources.*

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

All 42 road proposals submitted by State are in T2 category.

#### 8. District wise details of current proposals (Roads)

	As Per Pre-EC					As Per OMMAS (16-02-2024)				
District	3.75 m					3.75 m				
	Nos	Length in	Avg Pav Cost	Avg Non Pav Cost	Avg Total Cost	Nos	Length in	Avg Pav Cost	Avg Non Pav Cost	Avg Total Cost
		(km)	(lakh/km)				(km)	(lakh/km)		
Dhalai	8	40.272	132.79	20.29	153.08	8	40.272	85.83	8.22	94.05
Gomati	14	19.727	121.28	22.47	143.75	19	27.686	89.03	14.76	103.79
Khowai	1	3.033	117.32	38.39	155.71	1	3.033	85.10	10.06	95.17
North	-	-	-	-	-	8	35.027	84.65	7.72	92.37

<b>Tripura</b>										
<b>South Tripura</b>	-	-	-	-	-	3	3.715	90.85	8.65	99.50
<b>Unakoti</b>	3	10.821	150.37	33.72	184.09	3	10.821	83.44	12.23	95.68
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>73.853</b>	<b>131.66</b>	<b>23.58</b>	<b>155.24</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>120.554</b>	<b>86.14</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>96.14</b>

#### 9. Details of Pavement cost/km

Sl. No	Pavement cost/km	No of roads
		3.75 m
1	70-80	04
2	80-90	30
3	90-100	08
<b>Total</b>		<b>42</b>

State was advised to re-examine DPRs of pavement cost more than 90 lakh/km.

#### 10. Details of Non-Pavement cost/km

Sl. No	Non Pavement cost/km	No of roads
		3.75 m
1	Less than 10	20
2	10 to 20	20
3	40-50	1
4	>50	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>42</b>

NRIDA was asked to re-examine 2 DPRs where non pavement cost is more than 40 lakh /km.

#### 11. Pre-EC Compliances:

- State has apprised EC that 25 mm MSS had been corrected to 20 mm MSS in DPRs.
- During Pre-EC, State was advised to consider 100 mm GSB, 100 mm WMM and 20 mm MSS for all roads, which is technically correct for T2 and T3 traffic category as per IRC SP: 72 as all proposed roads are in T2 category. As advised, correction has been done by State and updated on OMMAS.
- State informed that Transect Walk Summary details are attached in the DPR, as advised.
- During Pre-EC State was advised to correct higher specification cost (for utility shifting shifting) as per site requirement. State apprised EC that higher specification cost (for utility shifting shifting) will be zero (0) and necessary corrections have been made in DPRs as well as on OMMAS.

## **12. Maintenance**

State proposed Rs. 1202.78 lakh for 5 years routine maintenance, which was 10.37% of the construction cost. Similarly, for 6<sup>th</sup> year renewal cost is Rs. 7763.15 lakh, which was 66.97% of the construction cost and very high. EC advised State to correct 6<sup>th</sup> year renewal cost as per permissible limit of the construction cost.

**13.** 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 road proposals as mentioned at para -2 above.

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

\*\*\*\*\*