

**CONSTRUCTION AND UTILIZATION OF
LIMITED HEIGHT SUBWAY (LHS)**

MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(2022-23)**

FIFTY-SECOND REPORT

SEVENTEENTH LOK SABHA



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

FIFTY-SECOND REPORT

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(2022-23)

(SEVENTEENTH LOK SABHA)

**CONSTRUCTION AND UTILIZATION OF
LIMITED HEIGHT SUBWAY (LHS)**

MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS



Presented to Lok Sabha on:

20-07-2022

Laid in Rajya Sabha on:

20-07-2022

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

July, 2022 /Ashadha, 1944 (Saka)

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson, Public Accounts Committee (2022-23) having been authorised by the Committee, do present this Fifty Second Report (Seventeenth Lok Sabha) on 'Construction and Utilisation of Limited Height Subway' based on Para 3.1 of C&AG Report No. 19 of 2019 relating to the Ministry of Railways.

2. The C&AG Report No. 19 of 2019 was laid on the Table of the House on 23rd September, 2020.

3. Public Accounts Committee (2021-2022) selected the aforesaid subject and allocated the same to Sub-Committee-III (Railways, Communication, Jal Shakti and External Affairs) for examination and Report.

4. The Sub-Committee-III (Railways, Communication, Jal Shakti and External Affairs) of Public Accounts Committee (2021-22) took briefing by Audit on 07.09.2021. Thereafter, Sub-Committee took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Railways on the aforementioned subject on 18th November, 2021.

5. The Sub-Committee-III (Railways, Communication, Jal Shakti and External Affairs) of Public Accounts Committee (2021-22) first considered and adopted the Draft Report on the aforementioned subject at their sitting held on 06.04.2022. Then the Draft Report was placed before the Public Accounts Committee (2022-2023) for consideration and adoption. The Committee considered and adopted this Draft Report at their sitting held on 15th June, 2022. The Minutes of the Sitzings are appended to the Report.

6. For facility of reference and convenience, the Observations and Recommendations of the Committee have been printed in thick type and form Part-II of the Report.

7. The Committee thank the predecessor Committee for taking oral evidence and obtaining information on the subject.

8. The Committee would like to express their thanks to the representatives of the Ministry Railways for tendering evidence before them and furnishing the requisite information to the Sub-Committee-III (Railways, Communication, Jal Shakti and External Affairs) of Public Accounts Committee (2021-22) in connection with the examination of the subject.

9. The Committee also place on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered to them in the matter by the Committee Secretariat and by the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

NEW DELHI;
July, 2022
Ashadha, 1944 (Saka)

ADHIR RANJAN CHOWDHURY
Chairperson,
Public Accounts Committee

(vi)

CONTENTS

	PAGES
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2022-23)	(iii)
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2021-22)	(iv)
COMPOSITION OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE – III (RAILWAYS, COMMUNICATIONS, JAL SHAKTI & EXTERNAL AFFAIRS) OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2021-22)	(v)
INTRODUCTION	(vi)
REPORT	
PART - I	
I INTRODUCTORY	1
II JUSTIFICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF LHS	3
(a) Construction of LHS at places with very Low Train Vehicle Units (TUVs)	3
(b) Construction of LHS at places where diversion road already exists	5
III PROBLEMS FACED POST CONSTRUCTION OF LHS	7
(a) Non provision of drainage system	7
(b) Accumulation of water in LHS	8
IV MAINTENANCE OF LHS	10
(a) Co-ordination with State Governments	11
(b) Accidents	13
PART – II	
OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS	16-27
APPENDICES	
I. Minutes of the First sitting of the Sub-Committee – III (Railways, Communications, Jal Shakti & External Affairs) of Public Accounts Committee (2021-22) held on 07-09-2021.	
II. Minutes of the Fourth sitting of the Sub-Committee – III (Railways, Communications, Jal Shakti & External Affairs) of Public Accounts Committee (2021-22) held on 18-11-2021.	
III. Minutes of the Fifth sitting of the Sub-Committee – III (Railways, Communications, Jal Shakti & External Affairs) of Public Accounts Committee (2021-22) held on 06-04-2022.	
IV. Minutes of the Third sitting of the Public Accounts Committee (2022-23) held on 15-06-2022.	

COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(2022-23)

Shri Adhir Ranjan Chowdhury - Chairperson

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Subhash Chandra Baheria
3. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
4. Shri Jagdambika Pal
5. Shri Vishnu Dayal Ram
6. Shri Pratap Chandra Sarangi
7. Shri Rahul Ramesh Shewale
8. Shri Gowdar Mallikarjunappa Siddeshwara
9. Shri Brijendra Singh
10. Shri Rajiv Ranjan Singh alias Lalan Singh
11. Dr. Satya Pal Singh
12. Shri Jayant Sinha
13. Shri Balashowry Vallabbhaneni
14. Shri Ram Kripal Yadav
15. Shri Shyam Singh Yadav

RAJYA SABHA

16. Shri Shaktisinh Gohli
17. Shri Bhubaneswar Kalita
18. Dr. Amar Patnaik
19. Dr. C. M. Ramesh
20. *Vacant**
21. Dr. M Thambidurai
22. Dr. Sudhanshu Trivedi

* Shri V. Vijayasai Reddy ceased to be a Member of Committee consequent upon his retirement from Rajya Sabha on 21 June, 2022.

**COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(2021-22)**

Shri Adhir Ranjan Chowdhury - Chairperson

M E M B E R S

L O K S A B H A

2. Shri T. R. Baalu
3. Shri Subhash Chandra Baheria
4. Shri Sudheer Gupta
5. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
6. Shri Jagdambika Pal
7. Shri Vishnu Dayal Ram
8. Shri Pratap Chandra Sarangi¹
9. Shri Rahul Ramesh Shewale
10. Shri Gowdar Mallikarjunappa Siddeshwara²
11. Shri Rajiv Ranjan Singh alias Lalan Singh
12. Dr. Satya Pal Singh
13. Shri Jayant Sinha
14. Shri Balashowry Vallabhaneni
15. Shri Ram Kripal Yadav

R A J Y A S A B H A

16. Shri Shaktisinh Gohil
17. Shri Bhubaneswar Kalita
18. Dr. C.M. Ramesh
19. Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Ray
20. Dr. M. Thambidurai
21. Shri V. Vijayasai Reddy³
22. Dr. Sudhanshu Trivedi⁴

¹ Elected w.e.f. 29.07.2021 vice Smt. Darshana Jardosh, MP appointed as Minister of State w.e.f. 07.07.2021.

² Elected w.e.f. 29.07.2021 vice Shri Ajay Kumar Mishra, MP appointed as Minister of State w.e.f. 07.07.2021.

³ Elected w.e.f. 09.08.2021 vice Shri Rajeev Chandrasekhar, MP appointed as Minister of State w.e.f. 07.07.2021.

⁴ Elected w.e.f. 09.08.2021 vice Shri Bhupender Yadav, MP appointed as Union Minister w.e.f. 07.07.2021.

**COMPOSITION OF THE SUB COMMITTEE-III (RAILWAYS,
COMMUNICATIONS, JAL SHAKTI & EXTERNAL AFFAIRS) OF PAC**
(2021-22)

- | | | | |
|----|------------------------------|---|-------------|
| 1. | Shri Adhir Ranjan Chowdhury | - | Chairperson |
| 2. | Shri T. R. Baalu | - | Convenor |
| 3. | Shri Vallabhaneni Balashowry | - | Member |
| 4. | Shri Jagdambika Pal | - | Member |
| 5. | Dr. Satya Pal Singh | - | Member |
| 6. | Shri Bhubaneswar Kalita | - | Member |

REPORT

PART- I

I. INTRODUCTORY

1) The Level Crossings (LCs) are very crucial intersection area for the road vehicles and for the railway traffic. These are provided to facilitate smooth passage of road traffic in a regulated manner and are governed by specific rules and regulations. These intersections also have high potential of accidents and put up a challenge to ensure safety of train operation as well as safety of road users. There used to be a lot of accidents on unmanned LCs causing deaths of road users. Initially, Limited Height Subways (LHS) were constructed to provide uninterrupted passage to Light Vehicles. To improve safety, Ministry of Railways decided to reduce unmanned Level Crossings (UMLCs) by Constructing Road Under or Over Bridges, Limited Height Subways and any other prescribed methods to minimize accidents.

2) As per the background note furnished by the Ministry of Railways, Railway Board issued orders in November, 2006 regarding elimination of level crossings by construction of limited use subways. The order stated that at many locations, the traffic consist of Light Vehicles, two wheelers etc., which can be catered to by providing subways of limited height which are economical. Railway Divisions were instructed to identify such unmanned/manned level crossings which can be eliminated by construction of 'Limited use subways'. Simultaneously, it was also instructed that Limited Height Subways should be provided very selectively with the personal approval of General manager at critical locations based on one or more of the following considerations:-

- (i) Safety Consideration: Accident vulnerable LC Locations where visibility is poor and elimination of level crossing will increase safety.
- (ii) Reduction in Level Crossings numbers: Elimination of Level crossings will yield substantial operational benefits e.g. section where the number of level crossings in larger or suburban sections.
- (iii) Site feasibility: Embankment height (3m) is adequate and will not allow collection of water under the bridge and surroundings, water table is low and approach road is feasible.
- (iv) Train Vehicle Unit (TVU): Locations where TVUs are less but have potential of getting manned or have already qualified.

3) Railway Board in March, 2010 observed that Railways are not constructing LHS if adequate embankment height is not available. Whereas with water proofing arrangements, like, retaining wall along approach ramp, top covering, water harvesting and other local measures, LHS can be provided in lieu of most level crossings. Therefore, all zonal Railways can plan construction of LHS in lieu of LC as one of the methods.

4) As per a White Paper on Indian Railways, 2015 the highest number of fatalities in Railways occur due to accidents at unmanned level crossings. CAG in its Report has recorded the findings of Indian Railways Vision 2020, that nearly 70 percent of the fatalities in Railways mishaps take place at unmanned Level Crossings (UMLCs). Thus, LCs are vulnerable points for accidents and were proposed to be removed by building Road Over Bridges (ROBs), Road Under Bridges (RUBs), Limited/Normal Height Subways (LHSs)/NHSSs and through other prescribed methods.

5) In view of the crucial issue of Level Crossings and the findings of Audit on Limited Height Subways (LHSs), the Public Account Committee examined the issue, taking into account the response of the Ministry of Railways on the findings of the Audit.

II. JUSTIFICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF LHS

6) As mentioned by Railways there had been a lot of accidents, particularly, on unmanned level crossings on the Indian Railways with the deaths of the road users. So, initially they wanted that these level crossings should be somehow reduced; and for that, one solution was that the limited height subways could be provided because there are many places where only the pedestrians or may be two wheelers etc. pass through. Then, Railways tried to take this solution for even the manned level-crossings also and for unmanned level-crossings. Since the safety was increasing, it was taken in a big way. Since, unmanned level-crossings are being eliminated new ones are not permitted. Some of the unmanned level-crossings were also manned. This figure was increasing, but at the same time this is also being limited. As on 01.04.2021, there are 863 unmanned level crossings.

(a) Construction of LHS at places very Low Train Vehicle Units (TVUs)

7) Audit found that as per provisions, locations where TVUs were less but have potential of getting manned or have already qualified for manning should be selected for construction of LHS. The Audit also found that Railway Board in August, 2014 further directed to close UMLCs having negligible TVU. Audit noticed that SECR violated the prescribed norms and spent Rs. 10.92 crore in the construction of seven LHS where density of TVU ranged between 68 and 321.

8) SECR informed (2017) audit that no guidelines had been issued by the Railway Board for fixing of minimum TVU for construction of LHS. While audit verified the case it found that Railway Board in September, 2011 had directed the Zonal Railways to eliminate LCs with very low TVUs, (less than 500 or so) by outright closure.

9) While the Committee raised issue about construction of 7 LHS where density of TVU ranged between 68 to 321, the Ministry in a written reply mentioned as follows:

"For closure of unmanned level crossing, Railway Board prescribed the method of elimination or direct closure with the consent of district administration. However, in cases where outright closure was not possible, other methods like closure by providing diversion road, LHS or manning of UMLC were to be adopted. Out of 358 unmanned level crossings on SECR, 46 unmanned level crossings were eliminated by direct closure and rest of the unmanned level crossing where Collector permission for direct closure could not be received, were closed by diversion/LHS/Manning etc. with State Government (Collector) permission. Accordingly, SECR took action to eliminate UMLCs by above mentioned methods. There were many UMLCs having less TVU, where collector's consent was not received for direct closure due to local public protest mainly for reasons like having cultivated land on other side of track and requiring frequent movement across the track by local farmers etc. were closed by methods other than direct closure. (Reference: Railway board's letter dated 03.05.2010). Therefore, these 7 unmanned level crossings (BK-105, BK-106, AB-14, AB-35, AB-44, AB-67) were eliminated by other feasible options like construction of LHS.(sic)"

10) Asked whether Ministry of Railways have taken necessary action against the concerned Zonal Railways for the construction of 7 LHS in contravention to the prescribed norms, the Ministry of Railways in a written reply stated that 'as such there was no contravention to the prescribed norms; hence, no further action against the concerned Zonal Railways was taken'.

11) Probed further, the representative of the Ministry of Railways during the oral evidence stated as under:-

"...If we close that level crossing, without providing any passage, without their consent, there will be agitation. In fact, for whatever below 500 TVU level crossings which were there, the South-East Central Railway had applied to the local authorities. They were able to get NOC from them for 46 and were able to close them, but for seven, they did not allow because of the agitation of the local people. For, those, we had to go for it."

12) Taking the discussion further, it was asked during the oral evidence as to whether Railway Board reacted to the agitation by some people. The Ministry of Railways stated that services are to be run if there is lot of need felt.

(b) Construction of LHS at places where diversion road already exists

13) The audit found that Railway Board instructed (2010) Zonal Railways to prepare a Master Plan for elimination of UMLCs. One of the methods of elimination of UMLC was diversion of road to other LCs.

14) While audit conducted joint inspection with railway officers it found that one LHS (BK 39) was constructed at a cost of Rs. 2.34 crore in 2014 while RUB was at a distance of only 134 m from the location.

15) Audit noted the reply of Ministry of Railways as under:-

"In reply, SECR stated (October 2017) that LC no. BK-39 was initially eliminated (March 2013) by construction of diversion road through bridge as an interim measure to enhance safety. During peak monsoon, the diversion road becomes unusable due to high water level in the bridge. As such, for safe movement of the road users in all weather, subway was constructed to avoid any mishap. At this LC, the drainage arrangement planned along with LHS work was not carried out by the contractor. Accordingly, the contract was terminated. However, the problem of accumulation of water and mud at this subway is being addressed by making suitable drainage arrangements in 2017-18."

16) Audit, during joint inspection also noticed that bases of the LHS at LC were lower than the existing bridge. The drainage system was defective and LHS was more prone to water logging than the existing RUB.

17) In case of LC Nos. AB-23, AB-24, AB-25 and AB-35 also, audit found that Rs. 5.37 crore was spent in the construction where RUBs were there nearby within 304 m

distance. Audit mentioned that the construction of these LHSs were not justified and were in violation of Railway Board's order of May, 2010.

18) In case of other LCs audit was informed by the Ministry that these were eliminated after construction of diversion road through nearby bridges but due to protest by local public who faced difficulty in negotiating additional distance of 300 m to 700 m demanded for construction of subways. In case of LC No. AB-23, the slope of the connecting diversion road was very steep.

19) Asked to clarify why LHS were constructed where diversion Road Under Bridges (RUBs) already existed at a distance ranged between 24 m to 304 m; the Ministry in its written reply mentioned as under:

"LC No. AB-23, AB-25, AB-35, BK-39 were closed initially during 2012-13 by construction of diversion road through nearby dry water way bridges as an interim measure in view of safety of road users and to facilitate the construction of LHS. Railway bridges are provided for water flow and not for road traffic but in dry season, sometimes end spans are used as temporary passage as in above cases. These diversions can be used during fair weather only and may affect safety of existing bridges due to movement of road traffic. In this regard, Chief Bridge Engineer/South East Central Railway (CBE/SECR) during his inspection of these sites, had also directed for construction of subways. LHS were constructed to provide all weather passage to road users and also to safeguard the Rail Bridges."

20) In case of AB-24, unmanned LC was eliminated in February, 2011 by construction of 2.5m clear height LHS with collector permission. But later on due to movement of heavy vehicles the height LHS was found inadequate leading to public agitation, therefore, as an alternate, path for heavy vehicles end span of nearby Water Bridges was allowed for passage of heavy vehicle during dry season.

21) The Ministry further added that diversion through nearby railway water bridges was an interim measure for elimination of UMLCs to enhance safety of road users.

LHS were constructed as public agitated for all weather passage as road passing through bridges were water logging during rainy seasons.

III. PROBLEMS FACED POST CONSTRUCTION OF LHS

22) The audit found that in March, 2010 Railway Board remarked that they were not constructing LHS if adequate embankment height was not available. This was followed and LHS was allowed with exception to some water proofing arrangements viz. retaining wall along approach ramp, top covering, water harvesting and other local measures etc. Audit, during joint inspection, further noted that there were problems post construction.

(a) Non- provision of drainage system

23) As per Railway Board's letter (April, 2008) the cost of approaches and drainage facility falling outside Railway boundary if required, should be borne by the respective State Government/local authority. The audit during joint inspection found that 11 LHS out of 18 LHS were non-gravitational where the water did not drain out automatically and needed to be drained out by construction of drains, use of pumps, sumps etc. Further, it was noticed by the audit that there was water accumulation during rainy season and in some cases throughout the year. In case of seven LHS drainage system was not constructed or partially constructed.

24) During the oral evidence, when it was suggested that the officers on the site are not properly considering the availability of drainage facility at the time of pre-feasibility study, DPR, designing etc. the representative of the Ministry of Railways agreed as under:

"Yes, very right, Sir. We are making use of all the technologies. Sir, at the moment, we are sanctioning work only when it is perfectly feasible and drainage, etc. can be provided. Hence, I stated in my presentation that a

Senior Administrative-grade Officer/Chief Engineer ranked officer ensures it, and once he clears that this can be provided or these things are available, then only we are sanctioning the work. Otherwise, we are not going ahead with it."

25) Audit found that LHS built is facing water logging during rainy season and mud is dried up and accumulated in the basement. In this condition vehicles prefer to move on RUB.

26) In 2006 Railway Board issued an order stating that 3 m embankment height is adequate where water table was low and approach road was feasible. This would not allow collection of water under the bridge and surroundings. Further, it was decided by the Railway Board that not RUB/LHS were to be planned where natural drainage is not available.

27) During the joint inspection, Audit noticed that bases of the LHS at the LC were lower than the existing bridge. The drainage system was defective and LHS was more prone to water logging than the existing RUB.

(b) Accumulation of water in LHS

28) Audit found that there was accumulation of water in 39 LHS of Nagpur Division, 11 LHS of Bilaspur Division and 7 LHS of Raipur Division. SECR stated that they have tried to provide gravitational drainage system wherever feasible in the past. Other methods viz. retaining wall along approach road, top covering of the approaches and drainage system were provided to avoid entry of water in the subways. The audit observed that with the construction of LHS with gravitational drainage, the problem of water logging could have been avoided at a large number of LHS in SECR. The audit also mentioned that in spite of adopting different approach to prevent water logging most of the LHS were submerged and closed most of the year, defeating main purpose of construction.

29) The major audit observations are summated as under:-

- a. The sign of water accumulation on the walls of LHS from 1 feet to 8 feet was visible and dried up mud was lying inside the 10 LHS (BK-12, TT-6, GCF-57, CG-1, BK-39, 388, 358, DD-16, DD-5, AB-16). During rainy season, these LHS remained closed due to water logging.
- b. LHS No. CG-7 in Bilaspur Division was full of water even during hot, dry summer season. This indicated that dewatering may not be possible during rainy season even after use of pumps due to high seepage of water. Audit found that people continued to cross the closed LC risking lives.
- c. Water accumulation with mud was also seen in LHS No. 286, 294 and 295 of Bilaspur Division during the month of December, 2016.
- d. In Nagpur Division, LC No. GCF-49 could not be commissioned due to water logging. Railway Administration replied (November, 2014) that LHS was functional, pumping was done as and when required and the LC is closed.

30) In another case audit found that in Nagpur Division LHS at LC No. 51 was processed for plain closure due to water logging, after casting of boxes and base slabs at a cost of Rs. 29.39 lakh. Audit observed that the problem of water logging was brought to notice by the concerned Senior Section Engineer (Works) only after a substantial amount had been spent over the work. Since one of the major concerns of LHS was water accumulation, measuring the level of ground water should have been done during estimation stage.

31) In a written reply to the Committee the Ministry further clarified that out of 57 LHS in which water logging has been pointed out by the Audit, gravitational drain has been provided and is working in 30 number of LHS. In remaining 27 number of LHS, arrangement of pump and sump has been made for pumping out of rainy/seepage water. Now all the LHS are in use and issue of water logging in these LHS has been handled effectively.

32) The Ministry further assured the Committee in its reply that before start of construction of LHS sites are finalized through preliminary and final survey of location by concerned Divisional Engineers/Senior Divisional Engineers and LHS are constructed after satisfying all prescribed norms for requirement of LHS as per drawings approved by Railways and district authorities.

33) During the oral evidence, on being pointed out that Ministry of Railways should have anticipated many things well in advance with regard to finding solutions for waterlogging, seepage etc., the representative of Ministry of Railways stated as under:-

"Sir, I just want to submit that with experience we learnt a lot of things. Of course, we have taken all those actions."

IV. MAINTENANCE OF LHS

34) In the Railway system, Member Engineering at Railway Board is responsible for maintenance of all fixed assets of Indian Railways such as Tracks, Bridges, buildings, Roads. In addition, construction of new assets such as new lines, gauge conversion, doubling and other expansion and developmental works are also undertaken by him. He is assisted by Additional Member (Civil Engineering), Additional Member (Works) and Advisor (Land & Amenities).

35) At Zonal level, the Engineering Department is headed by Principal Chief Engineer (PCE). He is assisted by various Chief Engineers for maintenance of Tracks, Bridges, Buildings, Roads, etc. Each Zonal Railway also has a construction organization headed by a Chief Administrative Officer (Construction) who is responsible for major construction works of Zonal Railway. He is assisted by various Chief Engineers (Construction).

36) Regarding expenditure, audit noted that in 2017-18, the total expenditure on repair and maintenance of assets by Indian Railway was Rs. 13,947.38 crore. Indian

Railway also incurred an expenditure of Rs. 38156.76 crore on creation of new assets.

(a) Co-ordination with State Governments

37) In April, 2012 Railway Board directed all Zonal Railways that LCs which did not qualify for sanction of RUB on cost sharing basis could be planned for elimination by subways, if found technically feasible. As per the direction Railways were to bear the complete initial cost of construction of subway and future maintenance cost of subway proper. State Government was to acquire and provide encumbrance free land free of cost to Railway area, where required. The responsibility for maintenance of road passing through subway, lighting, drainage system, diversion road and any other allied works, was also to rest on the State Government. Audit has reported their findings that SECR had written to the State Governments of Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra, Odisha and Madhya Pradesh. Only Chhattisgarh Government had responded with the reply that these works will be done only in Municipal areas. Audit had found that in case of Chhattisgarh only one (LHS DD-51) was in municipal area. No response was received from other State Governments. In May, 2014 SECR had requested Railway Board to withdraw the condition for maintenance and other arrangements through the concerned State Government, however, Railway Board did not agree with the proposal.

38) The audit noted that in Bilaspur and Raipur divisions dewatering was got done by zonal contractors in respect of seven LHS (LHS No. BK-11 in Bilaspur Division and LHS No. 388, DD-11, DD-16, DD-29, DD-42 and DD-47 in Raipur Division) and amount was spent due to faulty construction of LHS and due to lack of agreement with State Governments. In Nagpur Division, the work of dewatering for 20 subways (in Gondia -Chanda Fort Section under ADEN/Nagbhir) was awarded at a cost of `

25.35 lakh. Therefore, due to faulty construction of LHS and lack of agreement with State Government, SECR had to undertake maintenance and a recurring expenditure on dewatering of these LHS.

39) Asked further about the monitoring mechanism and coordination with State Governments the Ministry mentioned as under:

"SECR made lot of efforts in persuading State Government through regular co-ordination meetings to take their consent for taking the responsibility for maintenance of drainage, road and lighting arrangement in the subways. In spite of constant chasing with State Governments, consent was not received. However, Principal Secretary, Urban Administration and Development, Government of Chhattisgarh has given his consent for maintenance of subways in the jurisdiction of municipality areas only. Although, Government of Chhattisgarh has signed MOU for 6 LHS only but they have not taken over the maintenance of these LHS even after signing of MOU."

40) The Ministry also informed that *vide* letter dated 02.07.2018 Railway Board issued instructions to all Zonal Railways to undertake maintenance of road passing through subway, lighting, drainage system, diversion road and any other allied works in Railway portion.

41) Specifically asked why the State Governments were not taking responsibility of maintenance the Ministry informed that despite constant chasing with State Governments, through various coordination meetings, State Government did not come forward to undertake responsibility of maintenance. Government of Chhattisgarh agreed for maintenance of subways in the jurisdiction of municipality areas only. After that Government of Chhattisgarh has signed MOU for 6 LHS only but they have not taken over the maintenance of these LHS even after signing of MOU.

42) During oral evidence the representative of the Ministry of Railways stated as under:

"Because earlier we had decided that the construction of these subways will be at the cost of the Railways, but the maintenance of the road passing through, subway lighting, drainage system etc. will be done by the local authorities as per the other road maintenance. Later on, we found that the complaints were coming out to be little more and there were issues of water-logging and all. So, we went for taking the responsibility of everything – maintenance of the entire subway including drainage etc. – on the Railways' cost. Due to complaints about poor maintenance of LHS, Railway took over the responsibility to maintain these LHS in Railway portion."

(b) Accidents

43) As per Railway Protection Force (RPF) records, 3 accidents (LC No. 286, AB-16-Bilaspur Dn.LC No. BK 12-Nagpur Dn) had occurred during May, 2014 to December, 2016. The reasons for accidents were stated to be due to non-completion of LHS by scheduled date, water logging and non-barricading of closed LC and road travellers trying to cross tracks. The schedule date of completion of LHS at LC No. BK-12 was 11 September, 2013 which could not be achieved. Accidents occurred at the site on 22 May, 2014.

44) The Committee noted the Audit observation on the basis of report of RPF (30 December 2016) that an accident took place on 6 December 2016 at the LC no.286. In the report, it was mentioned that though the LC was closed, it was not barricaded. Audit reported conducting of a joint inspection at this LC on 7 December 2016 and reported its finding that the LHS was filled with water up to brink. Audit has further in their report stated that an accident also took place on 13 September 2016 as reported (20 February 2017) by Railways. It was mentioned in the report that there was heavy rainfall on the date of accident and the LHS was flooded with water. Audit also observed that as per RPF report (31 May 2017), an accident occurred at LC no. BK-12 on 22 May 2014. Audit observed that at the time of accident, construction of LHS

was not completed though the scheduled date of completion of the LHS was 11.09.2013.

45) Asked about the reasons for non-completion of LHS within the scheduled date, the Ministry of Railways in a written reply stated as under:

"There has been delay in construction of LHS at LC No-BK-12 in Nagpur Division due to ban on auction of sand mining and consequently non-availability of sand alongwith non-availability of OPC-53 cement. For the delay contractor was issued 7 days notice and penalized. The work has been completed and commissioned on 29.06.2017.

For completion of LHS in time all necessary site clearances such as cable clearance, caution orders and traffic blocks are closely monitored by concerned DEN/Sr DEN on regular basis. Further to expedite the execution of LHS work, execution program prepared in the form of bar chart is jointly signed by executing agency and Railways officials and progress is closely monitored and compared with as planned in bar chart.

During construction of LHS, alternate road connectivity was available. However, some road users did resort to trespassing, which resulted in accidents."

46) Asked about the action taken by the Ministry against the official responsible for the delay in completion of LHS, non-barricading of Closed LC etc.the ministry in a written reply stated as under:

"For delay in completion of LHS at LC No-BK-12 in Nagpur Division contractor was penalized while granting extension of time. The work has been completed and commissioned on 29.06.2017. For LC No-286, barricading of closed LC was done but the motorbike driver was trespassing at far away location from LC leading to accident. In case of AB-16 also two persons were trespassing the railway track which led to accident. Since, contractor of AB-16 was at default in providing proper drainage arrangement of LHS hence, his contract was immediately terminated after the incidence and corrective action was taken by deploying other agency and was completed within one month of incident.

All level crossings after closure have been barricaded.

Since the Railway Officials executing the works at these LCs have taken action as per contractual provisions such as imposition of penalty and termination of Contracts therefore, no action has been taken against Railway Officials executing the LHS works."

47) The Committee asked about the steps taken by the Railway to dissuade road travellers from crossing closed LC, Ministry informed of following steps taken:

- (a) Necessary Barricading is provided with retro reflective STOP Board to deter any movement during day or night;
 - (b) News of closure of LC is published in local Newspapers one week before closing of any LC to inform the road users;
 - (c) Road users are regularly counselled for using alternate road of LHS for movement and not to trespass/use closed LC any further.
-

PART -IIOBSERVATIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. The Committee note from the Audit observations that 7 LHSs were built in places where Train Vehicle Units (TVU) ranged between 68 to 321 which is far less than the prescribed norm of building such sub-ways only in places with TVU in excess of 500. The Committee find it surprising to note that while in 2017, South East Central Railways informed Audit that there were no guidelines issued by the Railways in regard to taking up construction of Limited Height Subways (LHSs), on scrutiny, Audit found that in 2011 a clear directive on the subject matter was actually formulated and issued by the Railways. The Committee are perturbed to note that the SECR were either not aware of the stipulated norms applicable for building LHSs, or chose to ignore the stipulations. Moreover, the Committee have not got clarification on whether the cause for the lapse was looked into by the authorities concerned and whether any action was taken against the errant for non-adherence with the stipulations. The Committee deprecate the failure of Railway Board in monitoring implementation of its own guidelines effectively and are surprised that Railway Board is not aware that one of its zones, SECR was not following its guidelines. The Committee desire for a suitable explanation regarding action taken against the officials concerned for permitting construction of LHSs in contravention of the applicable stipulations.

2. The Committee are also surprised to see that while the Railway Board has prescribed undertaking the work of elimination of Level Crossings with the

consent of the district administration concerned, which is of importance, and takes into account the ground reality, LCs have been closed and LHS constructed without the consent or discussion with the district administration concerned. The Committee wish to point out that LHSs have significant impact on the daily life of the people living in the adjoining areas and having to commute across railway lines. Therefore, it is not surprising that there have been protests when the movement of people at the site of LCs was affected. The Committee are of the view that had planning for doing-away with LCs and replacing them with LHS been done in consultation with the local district administration, public protests that were witnessed following the execution of the projects could have been averted. The Committee are of the opinion that the wasteful expenditure could have been avoided if the management of Railways had considered all ground level factors and followed the guidelines while finalizing the projects. The Committee desire that an effective mechanism of communication may be developed to get feedback from the ground level and effectively assess the requirement of the people so that while preparing Detailed Project Reports (DPRs), all relevant matters can be considered and unnecessary expenditure avoided.

3. The Committee find that in such cases guidelines issued prescribing TVUs merely remain on paper. In this context, the Committee recommend that guidelines issued in the matter may be revisited and reframed as may be needed, with clear action plan, considering all aspects. The Committee are of the view that sanctioning of construction of LHS overlooking the applicable 2011 guidelines of Railway Board invites appropriate punitive action. The Committee, therefore, expect that necessary action is taken for overlooking or

ignoring the prevailing guidelines. The Committee wish to be apprised of the action taken on account of acting in contravention of the guidelines.

4. The Committee note that 11 of the 18 LHS had no gravitational drainage system owing to which additional expenditure has been incurred for pumping out drain water, creating sumps etc.. The Committee are astonished to find that Railways have been sanctioning and undertaking construction of LHS which are 'non-gravitational', the matter having been pointed out by Audit consequent to their selective joint inspection exercise. The Committee also note that there was no drainage system or a partially constructed drainage system existed in case of seven LHS despite these being needed, in the places. While considering the above facts, the Committee are surprised to see the reply of the Ministry of Railways that all LHS sites are finalised after preliminary and final survey of location by concerned Divisional Engineers. LHS are constructed after satisfying all prescribed norms for requirement of LHS and as per drawings approved by Railways and district authorities. The Committee recommend that responsibility of officials concerned for lapses in regard to construction of LHS be fixed and action taken be communicated to the Committee.

Accumulation of Water in LHS

5. The Committee note the findings of Audit in regard to accumulation of water in LHS. The Committee cannot help but express their displeasure on the findings that in 57 LHS (39 in Nagpur Division, 11 in Bilaspur and 7 in Raipur Division) there was water accumulation. Even at the cost of repetition, the Committee would like to note the major Audit observations noteworthy as a

representative sample of the grave problem of water accumulation, which are summated as under:

- i. The sign of water accumulation on the walls of LHS from 1 feet to 8 feet was visible and dried up and mud was lying inside the 10 LHS (BK-12, TT-6, GCF-57, CG-1, BK-39, 388, 358, DD-16, DD-5, AB-16). During rainy season, these LHS remained closed due to water logging.
- ii. LHS No. CG-7 in Bilaspur Division was full of water even during hot, dry summer season. This indicated that dewatering may not be possible during rainy season even after use of pumps due to high seepage of water. Audit found that people continued to cross the closed LC risking lives.
- iii. Water accumulation with mud was also seen in LHS No. 286, 294 and 295 of Bilaspur Division during the month of December, 2016.
- iv. In Nagpur Division, LC No. GCF-49 could not be commissioned due to water logging. Railway Administration replied (November 2014) that LHS was functional, pumping was done as and when required and the LC is closed.
- v. Another LHS at LC No. 51 in Nagpur Division was processed for plain closure due to water logging, after Rs 29.39 lakh was spent on casting of boxes and base slabs. Audit observed that the problem of water logging was brought to notice by the Senior Section Engineer (Works) concerned only after a substantial amount had been spent over the work.

6. The Committee recommend that those responsible for the sanctioning of such projects with poor pre- feasibility study should be taken to task, suitable explanation sought from these officers and action taken thereon. The Committee are especially perturbed to note the silence of the Ministry over the spending of nearly ` 30 lakh in case of LH-51 in Nagpur Division where the Senior Section Engineer (Works) noticed the problem of water logging after the amount was expended. The Committee strongly recommend fixing responsibility in all such cases. The details of action taken be communicated to the Committee within six months.

7. The Committee feel that cases of water logging post construction of LCs, non-provision of drainage system etc. as pointed by Audit are part of wider problem indicating design faults which is a failure of engineering division. The Committee recommend that the Ministry of Railways should use all available technology and revisit the design phase of all those LHS which are 'non-gravitational' and a mandatory directive be issued to all concerned to ensure that the LHS is made 'gravitational' at the design stage itself. This exercise, the Committee feel, will help in evolving a near perfect standardized manual for construction and maintenance of LHS by Railways.

8. The Committee notice the findings of Audit in case of LC at BK No. 39 where LHS was newly constructed at a cost of Rs 2.34 crore in 2014. The Committee note the findings of Audit in their joint inspection along with Railways of selected LCs that a diverted RUB already existed at a distance of only 134 m from the location of the LHS. Surprisingly, this LHS was prone to water logging during rainy season and mud accumulated on the basement of

LHS due to which vehicles preferred using the RUB instead of the LHS. The Committee note in this regard that the interim measure i.e. constructing RUB to be a better option than the final solution (LHS). The Committee find that no forethought or planning has been done in construction of the said LHS at BK-39.

9. The Committee notice other similar cases from the Audit observations regarding LC nos. AB-23, AB-24, AB-25 and AB-35 constructed at a cost of Rs 5.37 crore where diversion RUBs already existed. All the LHSs built were in the range of less than 304 m from these RUBs. The Committee note from the audit observation that the construction of these LHSs were not justified and are in violation of Railway Board's order of May 2010. The Committee also note from the information furnished by the Ministry in this regard that the reasons attributed for undertaking construction of LHSs range from, necessity of eliminating of few LCs by construction of diversion road nearby bridges to pressure exerted by local public. The Committee nevertheless cannot help noting that the construction of these LCs are not only violative of the Railway Board's Order but are also cases of bad assessment of the need of the public in these areas which resulted in wastage of public funds. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Railways may have to comprehensively re-look the present guidelines on construction of LHSs and update the same in accordance with the experiences, inputs and feedback received so far. The Committee also reiterate the need for taking appropriate action against those who may have acted in contravention to the prevailing guidelines of the Railway Board.

10. Considering that the joint inspection of selected LCs undertaken was a sample case, the Committee recommend that, a thorough survey of all the LCs is required to be undertaken by Indian Railways in all zones at all LCs as a joint exercise of Railways alongwith concerned District Officials of the area in a time bound manner and the result of such an exercise be communicated to the Committee within a period of six months. Further, the Committee recommend that the shortcomings in regard to the LCs should be acted upon and redressed by the Railway Authorities.

11. The Committee are disappointed to note that despite incurring additional expenditure for addressing the problem, water logging continues in LHSs. The Committee desire that Railways take all necessary action to make all LHSs fully usable and ensure safe movement of the public through the sub-way passages. Responsibility in regard to managing drainage systems should be clearly demarcated. The Committee, in this regard, recommend that contact details of officers concerned need to be clearly displayed at the site of LHSs. The Committee further recommend that responsibility should be fixed on account of occurrence of post construction water logging, problem of drainage etc. that was witnessed at several sites.

12. The Committee note that instances where LHSs constructed could not be used due to water logging etc. only resulted in sheer wastage of money. The Committee are also concerned to note that in spite of water logging, LHSs are kept open and no evaluation is made of their utility or action taken for preventing the possibility of accidents. The Committee, in this regard emphasize the importance of taking time bound measures at the ground level

so that the problems posed on account of seasonal hazards viz. flooding, water logging can be effectively addressed and resolved.

Maintenance

13. The Committee note that as per the 2012 directives of Railways, the complete initial cost of construction of subways, and future maintenance cost of the sub way proper is to be borne by the Railways. State Governments are to provide encumbrance free land free of cost to the Railways, wherever required.

The Committee further find that responsibility for maintenance of roads passing through subways, lighting, drainage system, diversion roads and any other allied works, was to rest on the State Governments. The Committee are disappointed to find that these stipulations have remained on paper only and as per information furnished by the Ministry, there is no positive response from the State Governments on these issues. The Committee also express displeasure on the fact that no details are available with the Railways indicating as to why the State Governments have not been showing proper interest.

14. The Committee note the Audit observation that in Bilaspur and Raipur Divisions dewatering was got done by zonal contractors in respect of seven LHS (LHS No. BK-11 in Bilaspur Division and LHS No. 388, DD-11, DD-16, DD-29, DD-42 and DD-47 in Raipur Division). In Nagpur Division, the work of dewatering for 20 subways (in Gondia -Chanda Fort Section under ADEN/Nagbhir) was awarded at a cost of Rs 25.35 lakh. The Committee are pained to find that due to faulty construction of LHS and lack of agreement in clear terms with State Governments, SECR had to undertake maintenance and incur recurring expenditure on dewatering of these LHS. The Committee feel

that this expenditure was completely avoidable and concur with the Audit observation that role and responsibility of Railways and the State Governments for the construction and maintenance of LHS need to be revisited and clearly demarcated. The Committee are of the opinion that lack of response from State Governments to Railways is perhaps indicative of un-willingness of States to bear the cost of maintenance of LHS, especially as the design is reportedly faulty. Keeping in view the spirit of cooperative federalism, the Committee recommend that the Ministry of Railways should initiate steps towards taking State Governments on board so that coordination at the ground level becomes easier.

15. The Committee in this regard, also doubt whether, while framing the guidelines the State Governments were consulted and informed in clear terms of their responsibility, sharing of expenditure in regard to maintenance etc. From the response furnished, the Committee note that from 2018, Railways have taken over the responsibility of maintenance works of the LHSs that was originally intended to be that of the State Government concerned. The Committee desire that a 'designated officer' who can effectively monitor the situation pertaining to the maintenance works of the LHSs be assigned the responsibility of attending to maintenance works.

16. The Committee note that as per guidelines issued in 2010 by Railways LHS are not to be constructed if adequate embankment height was not available, with the exception being made only in cases where water proofing arrangements are available. While the guidelines are in tune with the ground reality, what the Committee find to be disappointing to note is that guidelines

pertaining to maintenance are unclear and do not clearly designate and bestow responsibility. The Committee note that as per the guidelines, the cost of provisioning drainage facility in areas that fall outside the Railway boundary is to be borne by the respective State Governments, but the Governments concerned have not owned up any responsibility. As provision of drainage facility was not considered to be any one's responsibility, and not stipulated in clear terms, maintenance work was not being undertaken.

17. The Committee also recommend that Railways should form a Committee of Senior Engineers to come out with solutions for mitigating recurrent and perpetual cost of dewatering in the sub-ways and find a permanent and low cost method of ensuring maintenance of drainage in all LHS. Steps taken in this regard may be intimated to the Committee.

Accidents at LCs where LHS could not be used

18. The Committee are aghast to note that as per report of RPF an accident took place on 6 December 2016 at the LC no 286, due to non-barricading of the LC although the LC was closed. The Committee note that the subsequent joint inspection of Railways with Audit revealed that the LHS was filled with water up to the brink. The Committee have found that the explanation of the Ministry given in this regard is evasive. While the Audit clearly stated that the RPF reported the accident at the LC No. 286, the Ministry in their written reply stated on the contrary that there was barricading, LC was closed, and the motorbike driver involved in the accident was trespassing the railway track at a location far from the LC. The Committee find the reply of the Ministry contradicting the Report of RPF, as cited by Audit. The Committee emphasize the importance of

human life and deplore the casual manner in which the railway has chosen to respond on the matter. The Committee desire that an explanation on the points highlighted in the RPF report may be given to the Committee and recommend that responsibility, as warranted be fixed on the official(s) responsible for getting the barricading done in this case, and the Committee intimated of the outcome at the earliest.

19. In yet another case of accident, the Committee take note of the findings of Audit that as per RPF report at LC no BK-12 on 22 May 2014 an accident took place. The Committee also note the Audit observation that at the time of accident, construction of LHS was not completed though the scheduled date of completion of the LHS was 11.09.2013. In this regard, the Committee also take note of the reply from the Ministry of Railways that since the Railway Officials executing the works at these LCs have taken action as per the contractual provisions such as imposition of penalty and termination of Contracts therefore, no action has been taken against Railway Officials executing the LHS works.

The Committee feel that the ultimate responsibility lies with the Railway Officials, and therefore recommend that simply penalizing the contractor and absolving the railway officers is not the solution and will not solve the issue. The Committee wonder as to why no action is taken against erring officers when there was a delay of more than eight months in construction of LHS and no warning/security was put in place for the general public. The Committee express the need for identifying the senior railway officers who did not report the delay nor act on the delay reported in this case.

20. Further, the Committee stress the importance of regular monitoring of barricaded/closed LCs along railway lines so that lives are not lost. Therefore, the Committee desire that a specific monitoring mechanism with earmarked responsibility may be developed.

NEW DELHI;
July, 2022
Ashadha, 1944 (Saka)

ADHIR RANJAN CHOWDHURY
Chairperson,
Public Accounts Committee

Confidential

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF SUB-COMMITTEE - III (RAILWAYS, COMMUNICATIONS, JAL SHAKTI & EXTERNAL AFFAIRS) OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2021-22) HELD ON 7th SEPTEMBER, 2021.

The Sub-Committee - III (Railways, Communications, Jal Shakti & External Affairs) met on Tuesday, the 7th September, 2021 from 1500 hrs. to 1635 hrs. in Committee Room 'D', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri T. R. Baalu - Convenor

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Jagdambika Pal
3. Dr. Satya Pal Singh

RAJYA SABHA

4. Shri Bhubaneswar Kalita
5. Dr. Sudhanshu Trivedi

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

1. Shri TG Chandrasekhar - Joint Secretary
2. Shri S. R. Mishra - Director
3. Smt. Bharti S. Tuteja - Additional Director
4. Shri Girdhari Lai - Deputy Secretary

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL OF INDIA

- | | | | |
|----|------------------------|---|--------|
| 1. | Ms, Dolly Chakraborty | - | Dy.CAG |
| 2. | Shri A.C Singh Laisram | - | Dy.CAG |
| 3. | Ms. Sangita Choure | - | Dy.CAG |
| 4. | Shri Manish Kumar | - | DG |
| 5. | Ms. Namita Prasad | - | PD |

2. At the outset, Hon'ble Convenor, Sub-Committee-III (Railways, Communications, Jal Shakti & External Affairs) welcomed the Members and Officials from C&AG Office to the Sitting of the Sub-Committee convened to have briefing by Audit on the subjects;

(i) xxxx xxxx xxxx xxxx

(ii) "Construction and Utilization of Limited Height Subway (LHS)" based on Para 3.1 of C&AG Report No. 19 of 2019; and

(iii) xxxx xxxx xxxx xxxx.

- | | | | | |
|----|------|------|------|------|
| 3. | xxxx | xxxx | xxxx | xxxx |
| 4. | xxxx | xxxx | xxxx | xxxx |
| 5. | xxxx | xxxx | xxxx | xxxx |
| 6. | xxxx | xxxx | xxxx | xxxx |

7. Thereafter, Audit officers briefed the Committee on important observations made in Para 3.1 of C&AG Report No. 19 of 2019 on "Construction and Utilization of Limited Height Subway (LHS)". Audit highlighted issues like construction of LHS at places where diversion road already existed, non-provision of drainage system, inadequate survey and verification of construction site which led to water logging, non maintenance of constructed LHS, accidents at Level Crossings where LHS could not be used etc.

8. The Members, while noting that the responsibility of maintenance of constructed LHS lies with the State Government and the local municipal bodies, stressed on the need for the Ministry of Railways to play a more active part in the matter. The Members also noted that there was lack of proper planning and physical verification/survey of LHS construction sites. The Members also desired that General Managers of the Zonal

Railways may be called to appear before the Committee for oral evidence along with the representatives of the Ministry of Railways.

9. The Convenor thanked the officials of C&AG of India for assisting the Sub-Committee during the deliberations.

The Sub-Committee, then, adjourned.

Confidential

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF SUB-COMMITTEE – III (RAILWAYS, COMMUNICATIONS,
JAL SHAKTI & EXTERNAL AFFAIRS) OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2021-22)
HELD ON 18th NOVEMBER, 2021.

The Sub-Committee - III (Railways, Communications, Jal Shakti & External Affairs) met on Monday, the 18th November, 2021 from 1100 hrs. to 1130 hrs. in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri T. R. Baalu - Convenor

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Vallabhaneni
Balashowry
3. Shri Jagdambika Pal

RAJYA SABHA

4. Shri Bhubaneswar Kalita
5. Dr. Sudhanshu Trivedi

LOK SABHA
SECRETARIAT

1. Shri TG Chandrasekhar - Joint Secretary
2. Shri S. R. Mishra - Director
3. Smt. Bharti S. Tuteja - Additional Director

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR
GENERAL OF INDIA

1. Ms. Dolly Chakarborty - Dy.CAG
2. Shri R.Subu - PD (Rly.)
3. Shri S.V Singh - PD (PC)

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (RAILWAY BOARD)

1. Shri Sanjeev Mittal - Member (Railway Board)
2. Shri V.P Singh - Additional General Manager, SEC Railway
3. Shri Pankaj Saxena - Principal Executive Director/Bridges

2. At the outset, Hon'ble Convenor, Sub-Committee-III (Railways, Communications, Jal Shakti & External Affairs) welcomed the Members and Officials from C&AG Office to the Sitting of the Sub-Committee convened to take oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministries of Railways (Railway Board) on the subject, "Construction and Utilization of Limited Height Subway" based on Para 3.1 of C&AG Report No. 19 of 2019.

3. The Convenor asked the Audit officials about the updates on the audit para. Audit officers then briefed the Members of the Sub-Committee on the current status of their findings on the subject.

4. The representatives of the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) were then called in. The Convenor drew the attention of the representatives of the Ministry to a number of issues like construction of Limited Height Subway (LHS) at places where diversion road already existed which resulted in wastage of public money, non-provision of proper drainage system leading to water logging rendering the constructed LHS unusable, ambiguity in the responsibility on maintenance of constructed LHS, water logging and non-barricading of incomplete and closed Level Crossings (LCs) leading to accidents, non-conducting of feasibility and physical survey of construction site before undertaking the work of construction etc.

5. The representatives of the Ministry apprised the Sub-Committee that construction of Road Under or Over bridges, Limited height subways were constructed to eliminate manned/unmanned Level Crossings (LCs) and minimize accidents. In 2019, all unmanned level crossings on the broad gauge section were eliminated and now only a few unmanned level crossings on meter gauge and narrow gauge remain. In 2018 the responsibility of maintenance of road passing through subway, lighting, drainage system & electricity in Railway portion of Road Under Bridges (RUBs) was given to concerned Zonal Railways. The Committee were apprised that to tackle the problem of water logging in subways, the Ministry issue guidelines and general solutions based upon topography, rainfall and bank height. A Senior Administrative Grade Officer (SAG) certificate has been made mandatory before sanction of work for drainage system which would effectively ensure proper physical and feasibility survey of the construction site. The Members of the Sub-Committee were also apprised of the remedial action taken on the findings of Audit. The representatives of the Ministry had provided RCC drain with retaining wall, sump and pumping arrangements at areas of drainage problem highlighted by audit.

6. The Members of the Sub-Committee impressed upon the Ministry that a more permanent solution should be evolved to tackle the issue of water logging at LHSs and necessary provisions should be incorporated in the design stage and preparation of DPR.

7. The Convenor thanked the representatives of the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) for furnishing valuable information on the subject and asked the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) to furnish written replies to the queries raised by the Members as well as to the list of points given by the PAC Secretariat within 15 days.

A copy of the verbatim proceedings has been kept on record.

The Sub-Committee, then, adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SITTING OF SUB-COMMITTEE III (RAILWAYS, COMMUNICATIONS, JAL SHAKTI AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS) OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (2021-22) HELD ON 6TH APRIL, 2022.

The Committee sat on Wednesday the 6th April, 2022 from 1500 hrs. to 1545 hrs. in Committee Room "D", Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri T.R Baalu - Convenor

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Dr. Satya Pal Singh

RAJYA SABHA

3. Dr. Sudhanshu Trivedi

4. Shri Bhubaneswar Kalita

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

1. Shri T.G. Chandrasekhar - Joint Secretary

2. Shri Alok Mani Tripathi - Deputy Secretary

REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL OF INDIA

Sl. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Shri Rakesh Mohan	Dy. CAG
2.	Shri Praveer Pandey	DG
3.	Shri S.V. Singh	DG
4.	Ms. Nameeta Prasad	PD
5.	Shri Subu R.	PD

2. At the outset, the Chairperson, welcomed the Members and Audit Officers to the Sitting of the Sub-Committee, convened to take oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of External Affairs on the subject, "Loss of Revenue due to irregular Tax exemption – South Asian University (SAU)" based on Para 5.2 of C&AG Report No. 2 of 2021 and to consider

the draft Report on the subject, "Construction and Utilisation of Limited Height Subway" based on Para 3.1 of C&AG Report No.19 of 2019

3. After some deliberations, the Committee adopted the afore-mentioned draft Report without any modification. The Committee also authorized the Convenor to finalise the Report on the basis of factual verification done by the Audit and place it before the Public Accounts Committee.

PART II

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Sl. No.	Name	Designation	
1.	Shri Saurabh Kumar	Secretary (East)	
2.	Shri Rudrendra Tandon	Additional Secretary (BIMSTEC & SAARC)	
3.	Shri Manoj Sahai	Joint Secretary	
4.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
5.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
6.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
7.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
8.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

A copy of the verbatim proceedings of the sitting has been kept on record.

The Sub-Committee then adjourned.

**MINUTES OF THE THIRD SITTING OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(2022-23) HELD ON THE 15TH JUNE, 2022.**

The Public Accounts Committee (2022-23) met on Wednesday, the 15th June, 2022 from 1100 hrs to 1610 hrs. in Committee Room 'D', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Adhir Ranjan Chowdhury ---- CHAIRPERSON

Members

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Subhash Chandra Baheria
3. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
4. Shri Pratap Chandra Sarangi
5. Shri Rahul Ramesh Shewale
6. Shri Brijendra Singh
7. Shri Rajiv Ranjan Singh alias Lalan Singh
8. Dr. Satya Pal Singh -- **In Chair (from 1100 hrs to 1230 hrs.)**
9. Shri Balashowry Vallabhaneni
10. Shri Shyam Singh Yadav

RAJYA SABHA

11. Dr. Amar Patnaik
12. Dr. C. M. Ramesh
13. Shri V. Vijayasai Reddy
14. Dr. Sudhanshu Trivedi

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

1. Shri T.G.Chandrashekhar -- Additional Secretary
2. Shri Tirthankar Das -- Director
3. Smt. Bharti S.Tuteja -- Director
4. Dr. Yumnam Arun Kumar -- Additional Director

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR

GENERAL OF INDIA

1. Shri R.G.Viswanathan -- Dy. C&AG
2. Ms. Ritika Bhatia -- Director General

3. Shri Deepak Kapoor -- Director General
4. Shri S.V.Singh -- Director General

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

1. Shri Kamran Rizvi -- Additional Secretary
2. Shri Rahul Kashyap -- Director, Delhi Div.
3. Smt. Archana Agarwal -- Member Secretary (NCRPB)
4. Shri Jagdish Parwani -- Director, NCRPB

2. At the outset, in accordance with Rule 258(3) of the 'Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha', the Committee chose Dr. Satya Pal Singh, MP, Lok Sabha to act as Chairperson for the sitting.

3.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
4.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
5.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
6.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
7.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
8.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
9.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
10.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
11.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
12.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
13.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
14.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
15.	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX

XXXX XXXX XXXX

16. The Committee resumed their Sitting from 1400 hrs and sat till 1610 hrs.

REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL OF INDIA

Sl. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Shri Rakesh Mohan	Dy. CAG
2.	Shri S.V. Singh	Director General

17. At the outset, the Chairperson, PAC, welcomed the Members and Audit Officers to the Sitting of the Committee, convened (i) to take further oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Jal Shakti, Department of Water Resources, River Development and Ganga Rejuvenation on the subject "Ground Water Management and Regulation" based on C&AG Report No. 9 of 2021 and (ii) to consider and adopt the following two draft Reports:-

- (i) **"Construction and utilization of Limited Height Subway (LHS)"** based on Para 3.1 of C&AG Report No. 19 of 2019; and
- (ii) **"Assessment of Assesseees in Entertainment Sector (DT)"** based on C&AG Report No. 1 of 2019.

18. Before commencing the evidence of the representatives of the Ministry on the subject "Ground Water Management and Regulation", the Committee took up the aforesaid two Reports for consideration. Following some deliberations, the Committee adopted the afore-mentioned draft Reports without any modification. The Committee also authorized the Chairperson to finalise the Reports on the basis of factual verification and present the same to Parliament.

19. XXXX XXXX XXXX

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF JAL SHAKTI, DEPARTMENT OF

WATER RESOURCES, RIVER DEVELOPMENT AND GANGA REJUVENATION

Sl. No.	Name	Designation
1.	Shri Pankaj Kumar	Secretary
2.	Shri Vikas Sheel	AS&MD, NJJM
2.	Shri Subodh Yadav	Joint Secretary(A,IC&GW)
3.	Smt. Richa Misra	Joint Secretary & Financial Advisor
4.	Shri Sunil Kumar	Chairman, Central Ground Water Board (CGWB)
5.	Shri Anoop Nagar	Member, CGWB
6.	Shri Ashish Kumar	Director, (WR,RD & GR)
7.	Dr. Ranjan Ray	Scientist-E, CGWB

21. XXXX XXXX XXXX

22. XXXX XXXX XXXX

23. XXXX XXXX XXXX

24. XXXX XXXX XXXX

25. XXXX XXXX XXXX

26. The Chairperson thanked the officials of the C&AG for assisting the Committee during the deliberations.

A copy of the verbatim proceedings of the sitting has been kept on record.

The Committee then adjourned.