

**No. P-17024/12/2021-RC (eFMS No 374852)**

Government of India  
Ministry of Rural Development  
Department of Rural Development  
Rural Connectivity Division

\*\*\*


Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi  
Date: 9<sup>th</sup> November, 2022

**MINUTES**

**Subject: Minutes of the Meeting of Empowered Committee held on 2<sup>nd</sup> November, 2022 to discuss project proposals of State of Jharkhand under PMGSY-III (Batch-I, 2022-23)-reg.**

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the Empowered Committee meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> November, 2022 at 3.00 P.M. under the Chairmanship of Secretary (RD) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State of Jharkhand under PMGSY-III (Batch-I, 2022-23).

2. State is requested to furnish the compliance of the EC to Ministry/NRIDA for sanctioning of projects under PMGSY-III at the earliest.

  
(K.M. Singh)

Deputy Secretary to the Government of India  
Tel. No. 011-23070308

**Distribution:**

- i. The Secretary-cum-Chief Executive Officer, Rural Works Department, Jharkhand State Rural Roads Development Agency, F.F.P Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Dhurwa, Ranchi- 834004
- ii. Chief Engineer, JSRRDA
- iii. The Adviser, NITI Aayog
- iv. The Director, Central Roads Research Institute, Mathura Road, New Delhi.
- v. The Secretary General, Indian Road Congress, Kama Koti Marg, Ranji Nagar, Sector 6, Rama Krishna Puram, New Delhi, Delhi 1100227.
- 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, 5th Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110001

**Copy to:-**

PPS to MRD/ PSO to Secretary (RD)/ PPS to AS&FA/ PPS to AS (RD)

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 2<sup>nd</sup> NOVEMBER, 2022 AT 3.00 PM TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF JHARKHAND UNDER PMGSY-III (BATCH-I), 2022-23**

A Meeting of the Empowered Committee (EC) was held through Video Conference on 2<sup>nd</sup> November, 2022 at 3.00 PM under the Chairmanship of Secretary (RD) to consider the proposal of the State of Jharkhand under PMGSY-III (Batch-I) of 2022-23. Following officials were present in the meeting.

Government of India Representatives	
Shri Nagendra Nath Sinha	Secretary (RD)
Ms. Leena Johri	AS & FA (RD)
Dr. Ashish Kumar Goel	Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA
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 I.K.Pateriya	Director (P.III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agrawal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
Shri Manoj Shukla	Senior Principal Scientist, CRR1
State Government. Representatives	
Shri Ajoy Kumar Singh	Secretary, RWD- cum-CEO, JSRRDA
Shri J. P. Singh	Chief Engineer, JSRRDA
Shri Rajiv Lochan	SE, JSRRDA
Shri Dinesh Pradhan	Finance Controller, JSRRDA
Shri Manish Keshri	ITNO, JSRRDA

**2. Current Proposal by the State:**

A detailed presentation on the proposal of PMGSY-III (Batch-I) of 2022-23 submitted by the State of Jharkhand was made before the Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:-

Item	As per Pre-EC				As per OMMAS dated 27.10.2022			
	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/m (Lakhs)
<b>Roads</b>	349	3172.614	1972.05	<b>62.16</b>	342	3147.535	2064.48	<b>65.59</b>
<b>LSBs</b>	155	5939.270	288.31	<b>4.85</b>	143	5559.83	270.80	<b>4.87</b>



Total	349 roads + 155 LSBs	3172.614 km roads + 5939.27 m LSBs	2260.36*		342 roads + 143 LSBs	3147.535 km roads + 5559.83 m LSBs	2335.28*	
-------	-------------------------------	---	----------	--	-------------------------------	---	----------	--

3.75 m width road - 314 No. & Length – 2823.42 km – Cost- 1765.93 Cr., @ Rs. 62.54 Lakhs/km

5.50 m width road - 28 No. & Length - 324.10 km - Rs. 298.55 Cr., @ Rs. 92.12 Lakhs/km

### 3. General Observations

- i) The State of Jharkhand has been allocated a target of 4,125 km under PMGSY-III, against which the state has already been sanctioned 979.351 km under PMGSY-III.
- ii) The current batch of proposals is for 349 number of roads of 3172.614 km and 155 LSBs. Out of 349 roads, 314 roads of 2823.42 km are proposed with 3.75 m width at a cost of Rs. 62.54 lakh/ km and 28 roads of 324.10 km are proposed with 5.50 m width at an average cost of Rs. 92.12 lakh/ km. State has proposed the roads of higher traffic category with 5.5 m width in compliance to the observations of pre-EC.
- iii) All proposals have been uploaded and scrutinized by the STAs on OMMAS. PTA scrutiny has also been done on 37 roads and 16 bridges.
- iv) The balance target for the state under PMGSY-III is 3145.649 km and the state has proposed 26.965 km in excess of the balance target, and the same should be deleted.
- v) State share has increased from 904.14 crore to 954.04 crores due to provision of BM+SDBC in the roads of T8 & T9 category instead of OGPC/SD and BM+OGPC+SC respectively. The additional cost on account of taking up BM+ SDBC instead of usual specifications will be treated as higher specifications for which state will have to bear the expenditure.

### 4. Planning Audit

- i) All the 342 roads and 143 LSBs have been uploaded on GEOSADAK. Out of 342 roads, 156 sample roads were audited by NRIDA team for their utility as TR/ MRL. 54 roads were flagged by NRIDA for which state was asked to give justification. Compliance submitted by the state in case of 1 road was not found to be satisfactory as per the following details:-

- In the proposed road “MRL04- Sisai to Honhi”, there is variation of more than 15% in eligible length. State representative mentioned that the varying length connects to railway station. The varying length is however not a part of the candidate road. *State was asked to re-define the candidate road by including this portion in the candidate road as the*

*same would serve a more useful purpose of upgrading the road connecting a railway station. State agreed to the same.*

ii) After pre-EC meeting, NRIDA has audited 44 proposals, wherein 3 were not found to be in order, details of which are as under:-

- One road "T06-T03 Dumri Giridih road to Barki bergi via Atki ,Fatehpur, Dhibra, Manjhladih" is ending at block boundary. *Committee asked the state to explore the extension of the road till Singhdi (521) habitation to make proposal more serviceable. State agreed to the same.*
- In the proposed road "MRL08-Nagar Untari to Tulsidamar", some length of the proposal is not part of the candidate road. *State was asked to either delete the portion which is not part of the candidate road, or include the portion in candidate road, based on the importance of the portion. State should provide proper justification for the same.*
- In the road "T05-T02 Ketunga to Bangal Border via Bareda", there is a missing link of around 1.3 km. State representative mentioned that, the missing link belongs to the state of West Bengal. *Committee mentioned that the missing link of 1.3 km should be included in the proposals of the West Bengal. NRIDA was asked to ensure the same.*

## **5. Existing Surface**

It was observed that 6 roads have 50-75% existing BT/ CC surface. NRIDA was asked to examine the same and the state should submit detailed justifications for taking them up under PMGSY-III.

## **6. High Priority Roads skipped in CUCPL**

It was observed that 41 high priority roads have been skipped from CUCPL as these have been sanctioned under state scheme and are under construction, 30 high priority roads have been skipped due to ownership issue, 25 roads due to forest clearance issue and 25 roads due to land issue. Committee observed that high priority roads cannot be skipped on the issues of forest, land, department ownership etc as mentioned and State need to resolve the land and forest issues. State representative mentioned that, 50 roads with forest and land issues have majority track portion, hence the roads would not be eligible under PMGSY-III. Committee asked if the roads with ownership to different departments are likely to get constructed by the owner department. State representative mentioned that, the RCD is in the process of sanctioning/ constructing the 25 roads in their jurisdiction. However, the irrigation department has not yet allowed the construction of the 3 roads in their jurisdiction. Committee mentioned that, these roads are of high priority hence will serve more population. *State representative mentioned that, they will include the 3 roads of irrigation department in state scheme and construct them from state funds.* Committee agreed to the same.



## 7. Average Cost Trends

- i) It was observed that, there is significant increase in the average cost of 5.5 m wide roads in the current proposal as compared to previous years. The average cost of 5.5 m wide roads was Rs. 80.97 lakh/ km in 2021-22 and it is Rs. 92.12 lakh/ km in the current proposal. Committee asked if the team from NRIDA has made any changes in the specifications to reduce the cost. NRIDA mentioned that they have saved Rs. 62 crore by changing the specifications. However, after the **state has proposed 150 roads of 1371 km with FDR**, cost has increased marginally and the provision of higher specifications has also increased the cost (for which state is paying). Hence, the savings of Rs. 62 crore has been offset by adopting higher specifications and more number of roads with FDR. The cost of higher specifications will be met by the State Govt.
- ii) Committee inquired as to the reason for increase in the cost due to adoption of FDR. NRIDA mentioned that in some roads, it is almost same and in case of other roads, there is a marginal increase due to better specifications. However, the quality and sustainability would be better. *Committee asked NRIDA to examine the proposal with FDR technology in detail.*
- iii) It was observed that, the average cost of bridges has not increased. State representative mentioned that, it is because they have used the SOR of 2021-22, however the SOR has been revised. Committee made it clear to the state that, *no further revision in cost of bridges would be allowed on account of change in SOR, if any, in near future before clearance.* State agreed to the same.

## 8. Distribution of roads based on traffic category

- i) During the Pre-EC 240 roads (80%) were categorized as T7, which was observed to be a statistical anomaly. State has now corrected the traffic distribution of roads. *State has submitted the ATCC survey data very recently, which is yet to be examined by NRIDA.* NRIDA was asked to examine the data and give their recommendations.
- ii) Committee observed that, the non-pavement cost of roads of 5.5 m width in T8 category is very high (around Rs. 27 lakh/ km). The reason for the same was asked from the state. State representative mentioned that, the higher specification cost has not been added in the pavement cost, which is why the non-pavement cost seems higher. NRIDA was asked to examine the same.

## 9. Pavement cost/ km wise details

- i) It was observed that, 20 roads in 3.75 m width category have pavement cost more than Rs. 60 lakh/ km and 13 roads in 5.5 m width category have pavement cost more than Rs. 75 lakh/ km. *State and NRIDA were asked to analyze the reason for the high pavement cost.*

## 10. Non-Pavement cost/ km wise details

- i) It was observed that 5 roads in 3.75 m width category have non-pavement cost of more than Rs. 25 lakh/ km and 9 roads in 5.5 m width category have non-pavement cost of more than

Rs. 30 lakh/ km. State representative mentioned that, there is some clerical error. No roads of 5.5 m width have more non-pavement cost and only 4 roads of 3.75 m width have non pavement cost upto Rs. 26 lakh/km. State was asked to correct the figures on OMMAS. State was asked to furnish the reasons for high non-pavement cost in respect of above roads.

#### **11. R&D Proposals**

i) State has proposed 220.05 km (67.1 km in T5 and 152.95 km in T6-T8) with mechanized surface dressing. State has adopted only 13.8% of the T6-T8 category roads with mechanized surface dressing, it should be 50% as per vision document, 2022. State was asked to correct the same.

ii) State has proposed only 75.833 km (12.22%) with cold mix, which should be 25%. State was asked to correct the same.

iii) *A detailed discussion on use of additive chemical stabilizers or nano technology in cement stabilization, rather than using the cement alone took place. As per the view of technical officers, including that from CRRI, the use of additives has been proven to be beneficial in repelling water and preventing cracks. More cement leads to more cracks. Further, the bond of granular material and cement which weakens over the time by using cement only. The bond however remains strong by the use of nano particles or chemical stabilizers. State was asked to take a view on this in consultation with NRIDA while proposing works with cement stabilization.*

#### **12. Pending Compliance of the state on previous clearances**

i) It was observed that, GPS tracking system has not yet been installed in key machinery and equipment engaged during execution of road works under PMGSY-III. State representative mentioned that, they have issued the LoA and the GPS system will be installed within this month. State was asked to parallelly develop the data analytics also. NRIDA was asked to circulate the forms prepared by Karnataka to all the states, so that data analytics starts immediately after installation of the system.

#### **13. Physical Progress**

i) It was observed that, 175 km remain balance under PMGSY-I. State was asked to expedite the completion of these works.

ii) It was observed that 1244 km remain balance under RCPLWEA, and 18 km and 12 bridges are still un-awarded. State was asked to award the works at the earliest and expedite the completion of balance works.



ii) The Annual Physical target allotted to the state is 1802 km, against which, state has so far completed only 198 km (10%). State was asked to increase the pace of construction, so as to achieve the annual target.

iii) State was asked to look into the complaint forwarded by the Ministry and submit the enquiry report at the earliest.

iii) It was observed that, in the FY 2021-22, against the maintenance liability of Rs. 102.39 crore, expenditure of only Rs. 59.02 crore has been incurred by the state. State was asked to incur enough expenditure against the liability. It was observed that, state has not been incurring enough expenditure on DLP maintenance since the last few years. ***Committee asked the state to incur enough expenditure (around Rs. 150 crore) on DLP maintenance including previous liabilities in the FY 2022-23.***

#### **14. eMarg**

i) In eMarg, it was observed that 275 (7%) roads are pending for locking on eMarg, MEE is pending for 516 (13%) packages, routine inspection (RI) has been missed on 615 (41%) packages and out of Packages with pending payment for >3 months, 1230 (46%) packages are pending for first payment. State was asked to look into it and improve the progress on eMarg.

ii) The expenditure done through eMarg in FY 2022-23 is Rs. 26.18 crore, of which, only 6.03 crore (23%) has been spent on liability of FY 2022-23. State was asked to make all the payments through eMarg only and clear the pending liabilities of previous years.

#### **15. Quality**

i) Lab has not been established in 14 packages. State was asked to establish labs in all the packages.

ii) 6 works have not been inspected by SQMs even once, out of which 5 are more than 12 months old. State was asked to carry out SQM inspection on these works.

iii) Total 2945 SQM inspections (1893 for regular PMGSY and 1052 for RCPLWEA) were targeted in the state during FY 2022-23, against which, only 1393 SQM inspections (1261 for regular PMGSY and 132 for RCPLWEA) have been conducted so far. ***State was asked to increase the pace of SQM inspections, so as to achieve the annual target.***

iii) During NQM inspections conducted from November 2019 to October 2022, 13.16% completed works, 9.24% ongoing works, 32.06% maintenance works have been graded as unsatisfactory by NQMs. The unsatisfactory percentage is much above the national average. During NQM inspections conducted from November 2021 to October 2022 also, 16.90%

completed works, 16.88% ongoing works, 18.18% maintenance works have been graded as unsatisfactory by NQMs. Unsatisfactory percentage reported by NQMs is alarming. State was asked to look into the quality aspect.

iv) During SQM inspections conducted from November 2019 to October 2022, 0.15% completed works, 0.51% ongoing works, 5.12% maintenance works have been graded as unsatisfactory by SQMs. *There is huge difference between the unsatisfactory grading of NQM and SQM inspections. State was asked to look into the quality of SQM inspections.*

v) 107 ATRs of NQM inspections are pending from the state. State was asked to submit the ATRs at the earliest. *ATRs pending for more than a year in case of completed works shall be marked as non-rectifiable.*

vi) It was observed that, more no. of inspections is being carried out by SQMs who do not give much unsatisfactory grading. On the other hand, the SQMs who give much unsatisfactory grading are not being allotted the inspections. The allotment practice adopted by the state is not correct. *State was asked to take action against SQMs whose grading pattern appears to be unrealistic.*

## **16. Financial Issues**

i) Audited Balance Sheet of all the three funds for FY 2021-22 has not been submitted by the state. State was asked to submit the same at the earliest.

ii) Audited Balance Sheet of Maintenance Fund for FY 2020-21 has not been submitted by the state. State was asked to submit the same at the earliest.

iii) Interest verification certificate for FY 2004-05 to 2009-10 has not been submitted by the state. State was asked to submit the same at the earliest.

iv) Interest recovery of Rs. 10.43 crore is pending from bank. State was asked to get the interest re-covered at the earliest.

v) 167 works are pending for financial closure for more than 180 days as on 31-10-2022. State was asked to get these works financially closed at the earliest.

**17.** 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.

\*\*\*\*\*

