

No.P-17024/15/2020-RC (FMS No. 371917)

**Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development**

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 18 March, 2021

Minutes

Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Maharashtra under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) for the 2020-21 (Batch-I)-reg.

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Empowered Committee held on 16th March, 2021 through Video Conferencing (VC Code:- 1326632) to consider the project proposals for Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action. The State Government is requested to furnish compliance on the observations of EC on priority.


(Devinder Kumar)
Director (RC)

Distribution:

- i. The Secretary (MMGSY), Rural Development Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bandhkam Bhawan, 7th Floor, 25, Marzban Road, Fort, Mumbai-400001.
- ii. The Chief Executive Officer, Maharashtra Roads and Bridges Development Board, Room No.- 214, Second Floor, Maharashtra Civil Secretariat-II, Maharashtra.
- iii. The Chief Engineer (PMGSY), Empowered Officer (MRRDA), Maharashtra Rural Roads Development Association, Government of Maharashtra, New Administrative Building, 3rd Floor, Opposite Council Hall, Camp- Pune-411001, Maharashtra
- iv. The Adviser (RD), NITI Aayog, NITI Aayog Bhavan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.
- v. The Director, Central Roads Research Institute, Mathura Road, New Delhi.
- vi. The Secretary General, Indian Road Congress, Kama Koti Marg, Ranjit Nagar, Sector-6, Rama Krishna Puram, New Delhi-110037
- vii. The Chief Engineer, Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, Parivahan Bhavan, New Delhi.
- viii. The Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Cooperation and Farmer's Welfare, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi, with the request to nominate an officer dealing with the Agricultural Produce and Live Stock Marketing (Promotion and Facilitation) Model Act, 2017 for the meeting.
- ix. All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5th Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110001.

Copy for information to:-

PS to Hon'ble MRD/PS to Hon'ble MoS (RD)/PS to Secretary (RD)/PPS to AS (RD)/PPS to AS & FA/PPS to JS (RC)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 16th MARCH, 2021 TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS OF PMGSY-III SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF MAHARASHTRA UNDER PMGSY-III (BATCH-I, 2020-21)

A Meeting of the Empowered Committee was held through video conference on 16th March, 2021 at 03:00 PM under the chairmanship of Secretary (RD) to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Maharashtra under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III, Batch-I, 2020-21). Following officials were present in the meeting:

Shri Nagendra Nath Sinha	Secretary (RD)
Smt. Alka Upadhyaya	Addl. Secretary (RD)
Dr Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary (RC), MoRD & DG, NRIDA
Shri Devinder Kumar	Director (RC), MoRD
Shri BC Pradhan	Consultant (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Dr. IK Pateriya	Director (P.II&III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agarwal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri Rajesh Kumar	ACS, RD
Shri SR Katkade	Chief Engineer, PMGSY
Shri R RHande	SQC
Shri Shafee J Sayed	ITNO
Shri Pravin Jain	FC
Shri Sangle S S	SE PMGSY, Nashik
Shri PR Khawale	SE PMGSY, Amravati
Smt Trupti Nag	SE, PMGSY Konkan
Smt NasimAnsari	SE, PMGSY Nagpur

2. Details of Proposal:

Item	As per Pre EC dated 21.09.2020 & 02.02.2021				As per OMMAS dated 14.03.2021			
	No	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km (Lakhs)	No	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km (Lakhs)
Roads	534	3,824.02	3,150.37	82.38	470	3,200.35	2,520.65	78.76
Total	534	3,824.02	3,150.37	82.38	470	3,200.35	2,520.65*	78.76

*MoRD Share: Rs. 1,486.27 Crore

State share: Rs. 1,034.38 Crore

Target: 6,550 km

Sanctioned: 0.00 km

3.75 m width road- 460 Nos & Length – 3,106.78 km - Rs. 77.54 Lakhs/km

5.50 m width road – 10 Nos & Length- 93.61 km – Rs. 119.26 Lakhs/km

STA has scrutinised all 470 proposals. PTA has not scrutinised any proposals on OMMAS. PTA should scrutinize minimum 10% of proposals on OMMAS. State has proposed 43.40 km length under RQI.

3. **Traffic wise details of road**

- (a) In 3/3.75 m carriageway width, 39 roads of length 229.45 km are in T5 category with average cost Rs 71.93 lakhs/km (average pavement cost Rs. 48.63 lakh/Km).
- (b) In 3/3.75 m carriageway width, 417 roads of length 2847.10 km are in T6&T7 category with average cost Rs 77.81 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 55.26 lakh/Km).
- (c) In 5.50 m carriageway width, 03 roads of length 33.09 km are in T6&T7 category with average cost Rs 93.14 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 66.36 lakh/Km).
- (d) In 3/3.75 m carriageway width, 01 road of length 4.04 km is in T8 category with average cost Rs 109.41 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 83.17 lakh/Km).
- (e) In 3/3.75 m carriageway width, 3 roads of length 26.15 km are in T9 category with average cost Rs 92.43 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 70.52 lakh/Km).
- (f) In 5.50 m carriageway width, 5 roads of length 41.18 km are in T9 category with average cost Rs 117.58 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 85.67 lakh/Km).
- (g) In 5.50 m carriageway width, 02 road of length 19.34 km are in > 2 MSA category with average cost Rs 167.43 lakhs/km, (average pavement cost Rs. 129.52 lakh/Km).

Following issues emerged during discussions for which state should give comprehensive reply:

- (i) It was pointed out that cost of pavement in T8 category is 83.17 lakh/km whereas for T9 category of roads, cost is 70.52 lakh/km. There is gap of 12.65 lakhs/km in pavement cost between these two categories of roads. NRIDA should examine this issue.
- (ii) During Pre EC stage 02 roads of length 19.34 Km were considered in 3/3.75m carriage way width with > 2 MSA category having average cost Rs 139.60 lakhs/km, designed with 3.6 MSA (average pavement cost Rs. 20.28 lakh/Km). Now during EC stage same roads of length 19.34 Km are considered in 5.5 m carriageway width with average cost of Rs 167.43 lakhs/km (average pavement cost Rs. 129.52 lakh/Km). These 2 roads are to be seen on the map and it needs to be ascertained as to what population and facilities these two roads are serving. NRIDA should check both roads in Geosadak and offer detailed comments. Also there is huge cost difference during pre EC and EC stage. EC desired to know the result of traffic survey of these roads. State should provide

comprehensive justification for these roads, whether these serve the objective of PMGSY-III or other objectives such as mining/industrial, etc. In such case the extra cost should be borne by the state. Proposal MH0831 needs to be especially examined from PMGSY perspective.

4. **Average cost trend**

- (a) It was observed by the EC that average cost of CD works was on the higher side which is quite surprising also in the context of low rainfall in eastern part of the state. State replied that many structures are piped CD works. State informed that there are minor bridges 6 to 10 m in span which are part of CD works. Therefore, cost of CD works is on the higher side. Empowered Committee pointed out that cross drainage cost of many states and even hill states are on lower side than the cost as projected by the state of Maharashtra. East of western ghat is an area which receives less rain fall, quite dry and may not be requiring such type of cross drainage structures. EC directed that this issue needs to be examined by NRIDA why this area has been provided with more no of expensive CD works.
- (b) EC also observed that on account of its hilly stretches quarrying should not be a difficult issue in the state, EC observed that cost of aggregate is higher in Maharashtra as compared to other states. State to forward detailed reasons and NRIDA should examine.
- (c) It is also observed by EC that average cost of all categories of roads is on a higher side as compared with average cost trend of sanctioned PMGSY-III works of other states. Empowered committee asked why rates considered by the state of Maharashtra are highest in the country, despite having no unique differences with the neighbouring states.
- (d) Empowered committee directed NRIDA to do cross comparative evaluation of SoRs, compare similar kind of items and check if any outliers are there.

5. **District wise details of current proposals**

- (a) Average cost of road and non-pavement cost is abnormally on higher side in some districts like Akola, Chandrapur, Aurangabad, Latur, Nagpur, Nanded. Empowered Committee directed NRIDA to examine in detail. Cost of 5.5 m road, its non-pavement cost in Chandrapur district is especially very high. These DPRs need re- examination. In Latur, non-pavement cost is of the order of Rs 40 lakh/Km. These DPRs need to be re-examined.
- (b) PTA pointed out that in estimates, state has taken work royalty and surcharge as 10% of cost. It has been found that State has applied royalty and surcharge in all DPRs. Royalty is not permissible on crushed material. In case royalty on crushed material is there, the cost of royalty charges should be under higher specification.

- (c) PTA has not scrutinized any proposals on OMMAS. At least 10% of DPRs should be scrutinized by PTA. High cost DPRs should especially be scrutinized and examined by PTA.

6. **The length-wise proposal**

- (a) Out of 470 roads, 06 roads are 2 to 3 Km in length with average cost Rs 79.74 lakhs/Km, 109 roads are 3 to 5 Km in length with average cost Rs 77.88 lakhs/Km, 355 roads are more than 5 Km in length with average cost Rs 78.90 lakhs/Km. State has intimated that average length of candidate road is 9.79 Km and average proposed road length is 6.81 km.
- (b) Out of the total proposal of 3200.35 Km of roads, 5.89 Km is from Brick Soling, 620.18 km is from track level, 163.06 km from Gravel level, 486.00 km from WBM level, 1864.67 km are BT & 60.55 Km are CC roads.

All the 470 proposals and their alignments have been uploaded in the Geo Sadak. Regarding 620.18 Km track level it was clarified by NRIDA that most of these roads are not 100 % track. There are roads in which portion of the existing surface is track. EC pointed out that there seems to be the case of multiple connectivity and as per PMGSY guidelines only upgradation is allowed. Finally, EC directed NRIDA to check all these track/gravel roads through satellite and check whether these roads qualify as TR/MRL in terms of PMGSY guidelines.

7. **Trace Map Quality**

Min. Trace Map Rank	Numbers of Proposals	%
1 to 15	308	67
16 to 50	93	20
51 to 100	46	10
> 100	13	3
Total	543	

87% of roads have been proposed from higher trace map rank. Reasons for selecting 59 roads with low trace map rank road-wise, alignment map of all these 59 roads and its UV with detailed justification are required from the State. NRIDA should scrutinize all these roads of low trace map ranks through GEOSADAK as well.

8. **Planning**

- (a) In case of roads less than 3 Km in length with trace map > 50, majority of surface is earthen. State should justify proposal wise how these roads are TR/MRLs under PMGSY-III objectives. 14 proposals still need clarifications. 7 additional missing

alignments have been uploaded. Justifications sought were regarding how these proposed roads are eligible under PMGSY-III. State should give detailed justification.

- (b) It has been noticed that in some cases roads are only being proposed till the District Border and not till their ideal location. Justification provided by the state is that ZP will undertake it. State should provide details of roads being undertaken by ZP and plan as per guidelines of PMGSY-III. Sanction/work order for the remaining portion of the road should be provided.
- (c) There are exclusions of 227 roads due to land issues. Most of these roads are 3.75 m wide. There is no widening of roads involved, then it is not clear how there can be land issues in these roads. EC pointed out that this seems to be an important issue if the thrust of the proposal is improving/upgrading the single lane road, then how these 227 high priority roads are excluded. Empowered committee directed NRIDA to check all these roads through satellite whether they are actually on site. If they are on site then they should not be excluded.

9. **DPR Issues**

- (a) A team from NRIDA along with 2 NQMs was deputed to the state for scrutiny of DPRs and State was requested to revise all the DPRs based on NRIDA observations. State has given compliance on DPR observations raised during the Pre-EC and scrutiny of DPR by the NRIDA team. However, this is still incomplete.
- (b) State should provide a copy of SLSC approval, MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats and consent letters of Hon'ble MPs on final proposal as per latest advisory issued by MoRD on 02 Jun 2020. This action should be accomplished now so as to save time in sanction of these proposals.
- (c) State should provide 3rd Party Traffic verification using ATCC and Axle load test data along with the analysis and recommendation of surveyed firm for sample verification at NRIDA.
- (d) The provision towards CD and protection works in respect of districts Akola, Aurangabad, Beed, Chandrapur, latur, Nagpur, Nanded, and Osmanabad appears to be on higher side. This needs re-examination to rationalize the cost.
- (e) The average pavement cost for 5.5 m carriageway in many districts is on the higher side. This needs detailed justification.
- (f) State should provide RSA reports for all the proposed roads.
- (g) State should adopt surface dressing for the proposed roads having traffic T5 category and less.

10. **Governance Issues**

There exists deficiency of staff at MRRDA. SQC, Regional SEs, EEs, DEs are all holding additional charge. ACS, RD of the state of Maharashtra informed that these staff are to be posted from PWD department on deputation. ACS, RD assured that within a month 75% of the vacant posts will be filled.

11. **Maintenance**

The State has proposed a 5-year routine maintenance cost of Rs. 168.20 crore which is 6.67% of construction cost and Rs 463.56 crore which is 18.39% of construction cost for 6th year renewal cost. However, the State was advised that the 6th year renewal cost should be accompanied by a post 5-year guarantee/maintenance period, and such cost should be a part of DPR.

12. **e-Marg**

Out of 220 total workable packages, 75% packages have been locked, 73% contractors have been registered so far and payment using e-marg has been done in 5% packages. State is advised to expedite payment on remaining packages.

13. **R&D Technology**

Sl No	Description	Minimum length to be proposed in km	Length proposed in km	Percentage of R& D roads with respect to total length
1	Technology with IRC Specification (Main streaming of Technology) – 10%	320.03		
	I. Waste Plastic		1,134.69	35.46%
	II. Other mainstreaming technology		307.56	9.61%
	Total (a)+(b)		1,442.25	45.07%
2.	Technology with IRC Accreditation - 5%	160.02	292.37	9.14%
	Total		1,734.62	54.20%

Although, 45.07% of total road length has been proposed using mainstream technology, against minimum requirement of 10% but most of it is under waste plastic. The State was advised to propose adequate length under surface dressing, white topping, coir technology, cement

stabilization, cell filled concrete and other mainstreaming technologies apart from waste plastic. 9.14% of road length has been proposed by using IRC accredited technology against minimum requirement of 5%.

The State was further asked to propose Coir Technology to achieve the target length of 470 km as per Director (P-II) letter dated 23.04.2020. However, State has now proposed only 99.98 Km while more than 600 Km of track/gravel roads are being under taken. State should further increase the length of road under Coir Technology. Low volume roads must use surface dressing.

14. **Maintenance of roads under DLP**

(a) Fund crediting data in maintenance fund account was not updated. In 2019-20, 79% of roads are having zero expenditure and in 2020-21, 97% of roads have zero expenditure under DLP. Empowered committee expressed concern about the regular maintenance of PMGSY roads. In reply, ACS RD of state of Maharashtra informed that they have taken cabinet approval for maintenance of PMGSY roads and this year onwards state government will give separate budget for these roads. State has also not updated renewal data on OMMAS.

(b) *It has been communicated vide Ministry's letter dated 12 January, 2021 that for fund release only such proposals which are compliant to para 19.3 (vi) of the programme guidelines shall be considered for release of the 2nd instalment of programme funds. Therefore, state should timely release and spend funds for maintenance of roads.*

15. **Progress of PMGSY works**

TYPE OF WORK-ROADS

S.N.	SCHEME	SANCTIONED		COMPLETED		BALANCE		UNAWARDED	
		Nos.	LENGTH (Km)	Nos.	LENGTH (Km)	Length (km)	No. of Roads	Length (km)	No. of Road
1.	PMGSY I	5,610	24,782.91	5,513	23,897.80	320.30	97	-	-
2.	PMGSY II	385	2,618.90	381	2,583.13	4.91	4	-	-
	Total:	5,995	27,401.81	5,894	26,480.93	325.21	104		

TYPE OF WORK-LSBs

SL.NO	SCHEME	SANCTION (NOS.)	COMPLETED (NOS.)	BALANCE (NOS.)	UNAWARDED (NOS.)
1.	PMGSY I	685	627	58	-
2.	PMGSY II	108	108	0	-
	Total:	793	735	58	-

Total 104 no of road works of length 325.21 km and 58 No. of LSBs are pending with the state to complete. State should expedite the progress of these balance works.

16. Quality.

- (a) Out of 158 ongoing packages, Lab has not been established for 13 packages. Photographs of the labs are to be uploaded even if these are mobile labs. Further, 40 works have not been inspected by SQM even once, out of these 30 works are more than 12 months old.
- (b) State has 80 active SQMs against the total requirement of 85. SQM inspection target for the year 2020-21 was 284 and state has achieved 160 inspections. Each SQM can do at least 10 inspections per month.
- (c) 2 ATRs of NQM observations in respect of completed works and 5 ATRs of ongoing works are pending with the State. Unsatisfactory grading is 18.18% for completed works, 3.30 % for ongoing works and 33.67% for maintenance works. Empowered committee expressed its concern about high 'U' grading and therefore, state should take immediate steps for improvement.
- (d) Various anomalies in respect of SQM inspection have been seen which area as follows:
 - Shoulders are not maintained properly and cutting of branches of tress are not done, though given satisfactory on maintenance road.
 - Cross Drainage is clogged & disturbed, resulting water stagnant and damage of roads given satisfactory by the SQM.
 - Condition of main Information board, citizen information board and logo boards are in a very poor condition still given satisfactory by the SQM.

17. Financial Issues

- (a) Financial closure of 03 physically completed work are pending with the State for more than six months. The State was asked to take immediate action and expedite pending financial closure of completed works.
- (b) State has not submitted audited balance sheet for the FY 2019-20.
- (c) State has not submitted interest verification report of last 10 years.

(d) State has also not submitted PMGSY financial reconciliation report.

(e) There is considerable difference between figures communicated by SRRDA and OMMAS (opening balance, contractor deposit and expenditure figures). Further as per the communication received from SRRDA, it seems that state is operating an additional bank account for keeping state share (for price variation). This is in violation to PMGSY accounting manual according to which there shall be a single bank account for programme fund. Moreover, these funds whether kept in additional bank account or regular programme fund account, belongs to PMGSY hence must be be a part of unspent balance available with state.

- (i) OB as per state is Rs 701.85 crore whereas as per OMMAS it is Rs 732.05 crore.
- (ii) Contractor deposit as per Utilization Certificate as on 01-04-2020 is Rs291.56 crore whereas as per OMMAS it is Rs 236.18 crore.
- (iii) A sum of Rs124.78 crore is shown as utilized during 01-04-2020 to 31-03-2021 whereas as per OMMAS Rs. 97.91 crore is only incurred as expenditure by the state.

18. Subject to the above observations and concurrent action/compliance by the State Government as stipulated in the foregoing paras, the Empowered Committee recommended the above proposals as at Para-2 above.

The meeting ended with a Vote of thanks to and from the Chair.
