

**Minutes of the 33<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Building Advisory Committee (BAC) site visit followed by meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> November, 2016 at Conference Hall, Central University of Punjab, City Campus, Bathinda at 1200 hrs.**

The following members were present:

- |   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1. Prof. R. K. Kohli                                      | - Chairman               |
| 2. Dr. Jagdeep Singh, Registrar, CUPB                     | - Member Secretary       |
| 3. Prof. Manjit Bansal, GZSCET                            | - Member                 |
| 4. Prof. Ripu Daman Singh, GZSCET                         | - Member                 |
| 5. Er. S. S. Sekhon, XEN PWD (Representative of SE, PWD)  | - Member                 |
| 6. Er. Manjiit Singh, Additional S.E., GNDTP              | - Member                 |
| 7. Ar. Surinder Singh (Representative of Chief Architect) | - Member                 |
| 8. Prof. V. K. Garg, Dean of Environment and Earth Sci.   | - Member                 |
| 9. Mr. Ajit Singh, Finance officer, CUPB                  | - Member                 |
| 10. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar, COC, Centre for Plant Sci., CUPB   | - Member                 |
| 11. Er. Prem sagar, Engineer-in-Charge                    | - Member                 |
| 12. Dr. J. S. Bilga, Consultant (Horticulture), CUPB      | - Member                 |
| 13. Er. Puneet, Assistant Engineer, CUPB                  |                          |
| 14. Mr. S. Balakumar, AGM, EIL                            | - Representative of EIL  |
| 15. Mr. BC Pant, Engineer-in-Charge, CUPB site            | - Representative of EIL  |
| 16. Mr. Diwaiyapan Mitra, Senior Engineer                 | - Representative of EIL  |
| 17. Mr. Sajjan Kumar, Deputy Manager, EIL                 | - Representative of EIL  |
| 18. Ar. S.K. Singh, Senior Architect, PSDA                | - Representative of PSDA |
| 19. Ar. Ankit Yadav, Junior Architect, PSDA               | - Representative of PSDA |
| 20. Ar. Aditi Joshi, Trainee architect, PSDA              | - Representative of PSDA |
| 21. Mr. Pandey  | - Representative of KSMB |
| 22. Mr. Rai   | - Representative of KSMB |
| 23. Mr. Mushtaq Ahmed                                     | - Representative of KSMB |

The first meeting of the new Building Advisory Committee constituted as per directions of the UGC vide letter no. F. No. 1-1/2012(CU) dated 17<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 was held on 11-11-2016.

**A. Site Visit of the Building Advisory Committee at Central University of Punjab, Main Campus, Village Ghudda, Bathinda at 1000 hrs.**

In the morning of 11<sup>th</sup> November 2016, the Building Advisory Committee visited the Main Campus, Ghudda to review the progress of work at site and to have physical view of the construction activities going on in various buildings. Member Secretary BAC welcomed all the members of the Building advisory Committee and apprised the members regarding the total layout and design aspect of the Central University of Punjab, Main Campus, Ghudda. The Committee visited all the under construction buildings of Phase -1A i.e.:

1. Academic Block
2. PG Hostel (Men & Women)
3. Dinning Block
4. VIP Guest House
5. Housing Type – A
6. Housing Type – E
7. Housing Type – F
8. Water Utility Centre

- a. The representative of the contractor M/s KSMB & Sons provided one no. actual Granite Chowkhat Sample in Bathroom of E-type housing Block. The committee deliberated regarding architectural, designing and maintenance point as well as structural stability of Granite Chowkhat provision. After due deliberations, Granite Chowkhat was not recommended by the committee due to weak bonding and possibility of crack developing after two to three years. It was also discussed and instructed to EIL to provide wooden Chowkhat in these houses as per original design.
- b. Engineers India Limited displayed the samples of vitrified tiles in their site office. The matter was discussed and after due deliberations, the matter could not be finalized due to difference in opinion of Architect ( PSDA) and M/s KSMB & Sons at site.

**B. Meeting of the Building Advisory Committee at Central University of Punjab, City Campus, Bathinda at 1200 hrs.**

Prof. R. K. Kohli, Vice Chancellor of the University (Chairman) welcomed the members of the Building Advisory Committee (BAC). He thanked all the members for sparing their valuable time from their busy schedule to participate in the meeting and to help the University in taking appropriate decisions on important matters relating to the development of the main campus. Before taking up of the agenda, the Hon'ble Vice Chancellor shared his apprehension about the slow-performance and non-seriousness of Architect and Engineers India Limited leading to delay in the construction of the Main Campus at Ghudda.

The Member Secretary read the agenda in sequence:

**Item No. BAC: 33:2016:1**

**To confirm the Minutes of the 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting of BAC held on 15<sup>th</sup> September, 2016.**

The Member Secretary shared that the Minutes of the 32<sup>nd</sup> meetings were circulated to all the members of BAC and no comments were received, the Minutes of 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting of BAC were approved (*Refer Annexure - A*) and circulated.

**RESOLVE:**

*Committee noted and approved the minutes of the 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting of Building Advisory Committee.*

**Item No. BAC: 33:2016:2**

**To discuss the Action Taken Report of the 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting of BAC held on 15<sup>th</sup> September, 2016.**

**RESOLVE:**

*The Committee noted it (Refer Annexure - B).*

**Item No. BAC: 33:2016:3**

**To discuss the progress and monitoring work of construction of main campus for Phase-1A with respect to schedule and PERT chart already submitted by PMC.**

The committee asked EIL to present the progress of the construction of main campus phase-1A.

8)

EIL informed that PSDA has submitted 673 "Good for Construction Drawings" out of a total of . The drawings for lab furniture of Academic Block are pending. PSDA informed that finalization of lab layout is pending from CUPB. CUPB promised to finalize the drawings of lab furniture layout by 16<sup>th</sup> November, 2016. However it does not hinder the overall progress of project. Further EIL informed that up to date overall progress of the construction work is 36.3% (**Annexure-C**).

EIL further informed that the phase – 1A works are delayed by 172 days from completion date as per LOA.

The committee asked EIL to explain the reason of delay of 172 days in writing and also to fix the agency responsible for the delay.

EIL informed that the delay in phase – 1A was accounted to short coming in the Phase -1 A tender (Jungle clearance, surplus earth transportation etc.) and non-availability of "Good for Construction drawings" as brought to the notice of Building Advisory Committee in its 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> meetings.

The committee pointed out that as the agreement was vetted by EIL before tendering and EIL should have examined the tender document critically. So that the basic items like Jungle clearance, surplus earth disposal etc. would have been taken care of.

EIL desired that the issue of transportation and dumping of excavated surplus earth at a distant place may be sorted out at the earliest.

The committee deliberated on the issue and pointed out disposal of surplus earth involves financial implication of approx. Rs. 107 lac. The committee inquired if the prior approval of the BAC for dumping of the excavated earth was taken by EIL. There has to be some valid evidence of levels, contours and the volume of the earth dumped. The committee also felt that CUPB has engaged EIL as PMC and their duty is to monitor, Check-recheck every claim of Contractor and take approval of the client rather just forwarding the demand. The committee instructed EIL to recheck the levels of the land as per the original contour plan and also asked to recheck contour levels of the ground where surplus earth has been dumped. The Committee also instructed EIL to provide:

- a) The quantity of earth work involved with reference to the quantities of original DNIT/BOQ as per site requirement.

- b) Detailed analysis of rates in respect of the rates being recommended for different leads along with reference to the relevant Contract provision that underlines the modalities of working out the rates of such N.S. Items. The relevant Contract Clause that specifies the adoption/reference of a particular schedule on which the rates of N.S. Items are to be based.
- c) The date of submission of Claims of Extra Items by the Contractor with reference to date of commencement of the items being referred to along with the relevant contract provision.
- d) Detailed calculations of Earth Work involved for the Road Work and the complete proposal for disposal of the Surplus Earth with tentative leads.
- e) Their final stand on the issue with a certificate that the proposal has been technically evaluated by the EIL and it is totally satisfied with the recommendations being made on the issue in line with the contract provisions.

The committee took a very serious view, of not taking prior permission from the client for the transportation of earth at a distant place other than specified in BOQ. The committee instructed EIL that before taking any decision which involves any financial implications to CUPB, EIL should obtain prior permission from CUPB.

Engineer-in-Charge of EIL also informed that during surprise check on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2016 (**Annexure -D**) at site the number of work force was 444, but it needs 300 more workers at site to speed up the work.

The University raised the issue that till date four Engineers-in-Charge have been changed by Engineers India Limited. It opined that that it is not good for the project as it amounts to delay and smooth execution of the Project. EIL has been working hard to achieve the targets but it fails to materialize and finalize the project milestones. There has been failure on EIL part. EIL assured that now onwards there will be no change in Engineer-in-Charge and the project will gain speed.

The committee directed EIL to get the building completed before June, 2017 including academic block, as promised in the 31<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 25-05-2016 at Engineers India Limited, Gurgaon office in the presence of Executive Director Mr. Deesh Pande. It reiterated that without Academic block, Hostels, Student dinning and the external services, the university campus cannot be shifted. These are our priority buildings. Delay in the date of completion will bring numerous problems, as the university is working from a rented building given by Punjab Govt. for a limited time period. Moreover, the MHRD/UGC is also pressurizing the University to increase the strength of the students which cannot be done because of

acute paucity of space in the present temporary campus at Bathinda.

The representative of EIL also informed the committee that contractor M/s KSMB & Sons is not complying the observations regarding the works issued by EIL. They do everything as per their convenience.

The committee directed to EIL that if contractor does not comply with their orders than they should take action as per contract agreement and impose penalty to contractor, if needed. The Committee also suggested that labour deployed for housing type buildings may be shifted to Academic and Hostel Blocks which are required on priority for shifting of the Campus.

The committee inquired from EIL to present the status of testing of samples from Shriram Laboratory. EIL informed that they have asked the contractor M/s KSMB & Sons time and again for getting the test conducted from M/s Shriram Laboratory. EIL also informed that as per contract provisions, they cannot force the contractor for getting the tests conducted from Shriram Laboratory

The committee directed to EIL keeping in view test authenticity of test results of M/s Shriram Laboratory, the tests may be got conducted from Shriram Laboratory as per Indian Standard codes and the results may be intimated to CUPB.

The committee asked EIL to present the PERT/Bar chart of the Phase-1A. EIL showed the PERT chart of the Phase -1A Buildings in panorama view. PERT chart clearly shows that all the buildings will get completed by 29<sup>th</sup> September, 2017 (*Annexure - E*) if it progressed at current speed. The Committee was unhappy to find this delay inspite of the resolve of the BAC in its 31<sup>st</sup> meeting with the management of EIL at their office in Gurgaon to handover the buildings by 30<sup>th</sup> June enabling the University to begin their new session 2017-18 from Ghudda campus.

EIL on the other hand expressed that with the current speed and if there is no spillage, the task will get completed by 31<sup>st</sup> October 2017 and the Central University of Punjab campus could be handed over, the buildings for occupation by 1<sup>st</sup> November, 2017.

**RESOLVE:**

***The Committee considered the above issues and resolved to:***

*Handwritten signature*

- a. Take as a priority the construction work of the Academic block, hostels, student dining and external services (Development of construction work of Phase -1A).
- b. To have no further changes in Engineer-in-charge of EIL.
- c. Advise EIL to stick to the time schedule and complete the construction work for Phase – 1A in time bound manner as already agreed.
- d. Ask EIL to submit the PERT chart of the buildings with planned, actual site progress graph along with the work schedule for achieving the same by 21<sup>st</sup> November 2016 in hard copy duly signed by the authorized authorities of EIL.
- e. Ask EIL to get samples tested as per Indian Standard Code from M/s Shriram Laboratory.

Item No. BAC: 33:2016:4

To discuss the status of drawing submitted by Architect to PMC for Phase – 1B and status of the approval of building plans from PUDA by Architect and action taken in this regard.

a. Phase – 1B:

The Committee enquired from EIL to clarify the validity of financial bid of Phase -1B.

EIL informed that the actual validity of the bid was up to 10.11.2016. But in view of the non-availability of approval of building plans from PUDA, the bid validity has been extended up to 09.12.2016. EIL informed to the committee that the extension of bid is not extendable further.

The Committee asked EIL to provide the status of GFC drawings as it was decided in the 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting of BAC that all approved and vetted GFC drawings from EIL should be made available at the time of issuance of LOA. It was also agreed by PSDA during the 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Building Advisory committee that "Good for Construction drawings" structural and Architectural drawings shall be prepared and submit the same to EIL by 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016 and service drawings by 10<sup>th</sup> October 2016. So EIL was asked to explain the fresh status of "Good for Construction" drawings of Phase – 1B.

The representative of EIL informed the committee that the status of "Good for Construction Drawings" received from PSDA (**Annexure - F**) as on date is as following:

1. Structural Drawing: 78 out of 85.
2. Architectural Drawing: 35 out of 101.

Further EIL informed that PSDA failed to provide the drawings on committed dates and these drawings were insufficient to allot the construction work of Phase – 1B to L-1 firm. EIL further informed that the GFC drawings provided by PSDA were also incomplete, and the drawings submitted were complete up to plinth level only.

The committee took a very serious view, of the non-delivering of GFC drawings by the PSDA. The committee expressed displeasure to the Architect and asked as to how much more time he will take to submit all the Structural and Architectural drawings. He agreed to prepare the structural, Architectural and Service GFC drawings & submits the same to EIL by 30<sup>th</sup> November 2016. If the architect fails to provide the drawings as per committed dates, the committee authorized the university to take a strict action impose or heavy penalty against the Architect to the extent of initiating the process to change the architect as per the agreement.

EIL also informed that the approval of the building plan for phase – 1B is still pending. As it was decided in the 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting of BAC, the PSDA was required to get the approval from PUDA by 30-09-2016 but approval is still pending. PSDA informed that PUDA raised some observations (**Annexure - G**) and the observations were compiled on 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2016. PSDA also informed to the committee that the approval of the building plans shall be obtained by 25-11-2016. The committee took a very serious view of PSDA for not taking this issue seriously. Further the committee asked PSDA to get the approval of the building plans from PUDA as early as possible so that the Letter of Award to the L-1 firm for Phase – 1B building can processed.

The representatives of the contractor were also intimated before the committee to express our concern on account of the delay in construction. The chairman of the committee made it clear to the representative of M/s KSMB & Sons that Phase -1 B contract shall only be issued to them if satisfactory progress is shown in construction of Phase – 1A. The representatives promised to speed up the work and complete it at the earliest.

**RESOLVE:**

- The Committee considered the above issues and resolved to:*
- a. Instruct PSDA to submit architectural and structural drawings to EIL by 30<sup>th</sup> November 2016.*
  - b. Instruct PSDA that the approval of the Building plans from PUDA will be made available before 25<sup>th</sup> November 2016.*
  - c. Allotment of LOA to L-1 firm i.e. M/s KSMB & Sons shall be processed after approval of Building plans from PUDA.*
  - d. Penalty clause be evoked in case of any delay on the part of PSDA in submitting the approved drawings from the dates committed.*

Item No. BAC: 33:2016:5

To approve the samples of various architectural items as intimated by Engineers India Limited vide email dated 27-10-2016 for Phase - 1A.

EIL submitted 13 no. of different colour of vitrified tile samples for approval of BAC. These samples were inspected by the BAC members and observed that all the samples submitted by the contractor were of glossy finish. Architect also raised the issue regarding glossy finish of the vitrified tiles and desired that the finish of the vitrified tile should be of matt finish. Architect also intimated that while preparing the tender document the estimated cost was worked out with tile costing Rs. 650/sqm and in this range tiles are available with matt finish and covered as per BOQ of the tender document.

EIL informed the committee that contractor provided the sample of the tiles costing Rs. 405/sqm with glossy finish. The Member Secretary pointed out that if the tile sample is not approved by Architect then why it has been put up to CUPB for consideration and approval.

After due deliberations, considering the nature and age of the students and staff glossy finish tiles being slippery are not to be used on the campus. Only the matt finish finished vitrified tiles as per the terms of the contract be shown for approval of the CUPB. The committee authorized the Chairman to constitute a committee to finalize the samples of vitrified tiles with in the contract agreement provisions.

**RESOLVE:**

*The committee authorized the Chairman to constitute a committee for finalization of the samples of vitrified tiles.*

Item No. BAC: 33:2016:6

Reconstitution of Subcommittee of Building Advisory Committee.

**RESOLVE:**

*The committee authorized the Chairman to constitute suitable subcommittee of Building Advisory Committee.*

Item No. BAC: 33:2016:7

Any other item with the permission of the Chair.

*NIL*

Item No. BAC: 33:2016:8

Current agenda


*NIL*

Item No. BAC: 33:2016:9

Fixing the date of the next meeting of the Building Advisory Committee.

The Committee authorized the Chairman to decide the date of next meeting.

**Meeting ended with the thanks to the Chair.**

  
Dr. Jagdeep Singh  
Registrar & Member Secretary