

557302/2020/Administration

अपर सचिव एवं महानिदेशक (एन आर आई डी ए)

Alka Upadhyaya

Additional Secretary & DG (NRIDA)

Tel. : 23383880

Fax : 23381268

E-mail : ualka@ias.nic.in



भारत सरकार
ग्रामीण विकास मंत्रालय
ग्रामीण विकास विभाग
कृषि भवन, नई दिल्ली-110001
Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development
Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi-110001

DO Lr No. PO17(12)/5/2019-Dir (Tech) (368882)

dated 31st July 2020

Subject: Common DPR observations under PMGSY-III DPRs

Dear Colleagues .

The Ministry has so far received proposals from 12 States under PMGSY III. The remaining States are in the process of preparing DRRPs and DPRs. As you may be aware, NRIDA takes up verification 15% of the DPRs proposed for sanction under each batch as mandated in the guidelines. It has been observed that the sample DPRs received from the States abound with lot of short comings even after being vetted by the State and STAs. The common deficiencies found in the DPRs are listed below,

1. Transect Walk photographs and Transect walk summary are not attached with the DPRs which is mandatory as per para 7.5 of PMGSY-III guidelines.
2. An Independent 3rd Party Traffic survey is mandatory for the roads proposed with more than 1 MSA traffic and Axle load survey is to be carried out on proposed roads which are to be designed for projected traffic more than 1 MSA and carriageway width of 5.5 m. States are proposing about 30% of the roads with more than 1 MSA traffic and 3rd party traffic verification reports are not found attached with any of the DPRs.
3. An independent Roads Safety Audit (RSA) is to be carried out during design stage of the roads exceeding 5 Km length and should be enclosed as a part of the DPR. Road Safety Audit is a mandatory requirement while preparing the DPR and it shall be audited by a certified road safety auditor. However, the RSA has not been conducted and without RSA report the proposals are being submitted to Ministry for approval.
4. Majority of the roads proposed under PMGSY-III are existing BT roads and due credit for the existing pavement layers should be given after proper evaluation existing pavement compositions while designing the pavement. IRC: SP:72:2015 specifies the overlay thickness to be provided for up-gradation /strengthening of existing roads under clause 2.2.3. It is noted while scrutinising the DPRs, the entire pavement is proposed for removal and provisions made to for construction from sub grade level as in the case of new construction. The credit given for existing pavement layers in certain cases is also very meager, which unnecessarily inflates the cost of construction.
5. Majority of the roads proposed with 5.50 m carriageway width without considering the traffic capacity and in some cases existing earthen track is being proposed for 5.50 m carriageway width.
6. Certain good quality roads/ portion of a road have been proposed for up gradation which requires only Riding Quality Improvements (RQI) as per the photographs attached to the

- DPRs. It indicates that the DPRs have been prepared without considering the ground conditions which may result in infructuous expenditure.
7. The test results indicating LL, PI, MDD, OMC and CBR for GSB materials have not been attached to the DPRs and these details are necessary while verifying the compaction of GSB layer at the time of execution.
 8. All the existing Cross Drainage structures are being proposed for replacement with new CDs or the existing Hume Pipes Culverts are proposed for reconstruction with RCC slab culverts without studying their existing condition. Majority of the CDs seem to be in good condition which can be retained with minor repairs/regular maintenance. Detailed justifications have not been provided in the DPRs for such replacements.
 9. Length of existing/proposed Slab culverts, box culverts, causeways, Bridge portions are not being deducted while estimating the pavement quantity.
 10. Joint inspection of bridge sites needs to be conducted by Superintending Engineer and STAs or by the Superintending Engineer and Chief Engineer before preparation of DPRs. The report of such joint inspection needs to be provided to NRIDA which would form the basis of justification for the type of structure proposed. However, the DPRs have been prepared and vetted by STAs without joint inspection of bridge sites
 11. Provision of road safety items such as Road Studs, W beam metal crash barriers etc., are being provided on the higher side without clear justifications.
 12. The R&D technologies are being proposed without proper investigations and without enough justifications on the choice of technologies proposed.

In light of the above observations, it is requested that in future all the DPRs should be prepared with due care and diligence keeping the above in mind. You may issue necessary instructions to the PIUs and also sensitise the DPR consultants in this regard. Also, necessary action may be initiated against the DPR consultants as per the terms and conditions agreed with them for such lacuna in the DPRs. The STAs/PTAs are requested to ensure that the DPRs vetted by them are as per PMGSY and relevant IRC guidelines. This shall be ensured while scrutinising the DPRs which will in turn reduce the delay in placing proposals before the Empowered Committee and issuance of clearance by the Ministry.

With Best wishes,

Yours Sincerely,

Alka

(Alka Upadhyaya)

To

All Principal Secretaries of States Rural Development Department & PWD.

All CEOs/CEs, SRRDA

All STAs/PTAs