

File No-P.17024/4/2019-RC (Part) (FMS-368978)

Government of India
Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development
Rural Connectivity (RC) Division

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 6th April, 2022

MINUTES

Subject: Minutes of the Meeting of Pre- Empowered Committee held on 30th March, 2022 to discuss project proposals of State of Bihar under PMGSY-III (Batch-I, 2021-22)-reg.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the Minutes of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on **30th March, 2022 at 4:30 P.M** under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA (**through Video Conferencing**) to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State of Bihar under PMGSY-III (Batch-I, 2021-22).

2. State is requested to furnish the compliance of the Pre-EC to Ministry/NRIDA for conducting the EC on time.

(K.M Singh)

Deputy Secretary to the Govt. of India

Distribution:

- i. The Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Vishveshwaraiya Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna- 800015.
- ii. All Directors in NRIDA.

Copy to:-

Sr. PPS to Secretary (RD)/ PPS to AS (RD)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 30TH MARCH, 2022 AT 4:30 PM TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY STATE GOVERNMENT OF BIHAR UNDER PMGSY-III, BATCH-I of 2021-22

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (RC) was held through Video Conference on 30th March, 2022 at 4:30 p.m. under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Bihar under PMGSY-III (Batch-I) of 2021-22. Following officials were present in the meeting.

MoRD/ NRIDA Representatives	
Dr. Ashish Kumar Goel	Additional Secretary(RD) & DG NRIDA
Shri K.M. Singh	Deputy Secretary (RC), MoRD
Ms. Anjali Yadav	Assistant Director (RC), MoRD
Shri. B C Pradhan	Consultant Director (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Dr. I.K.Pateriya	Director (P-II & III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agarwal	Director (P-I), NRIDA
Shri Satyendra Prasad	Joint Director (Technical), NRIDA
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri Pankaj Kumar Pal	Secretary cum CEO, RWD, Bihar
Shri Kumar Rajeev Ranjan	Nodal Officer, PMGSY, Bihar
Shri Anand Prakash	EE, PMGSY, Bihar
Shri Ashok Kumar	AE, PMGSY, Bihar
Shri Prashank Kumar	ITNO, PMGSY, Bihar
Shri Prabhat Kumar	Finance Manager, BRRDA

2. Details of Current Proposal

Item	As per OMMAS dated 25.03.2022			
	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km (Lakhs)
Roads	475	4079.692	3179.80	77.94
LSBs	73	3120.760	189.34	6.07
Total	475 roads + 73 LSBs	4079.69 km roads + 3120.76 m LSBs	3369.14	

*MoRD Share : Rs. 2001.37 Crore

State share : Rs 1367.77 Crore

3.75 m width road - 398 Nos & Length - 3154.04 km - Rs. 69.31 Lakhs/km

5.50 m width road - 77 Nos & Length - 925.65 km - Rs. 107.36 Lakhs/km

3. General Observations

- i) The State of Bihar has already been sanctioned 1390.31 km under PMGSY-III.
- ii) State had earlier submitted project proposals for 220 roads of 1791.06 km and 30 LSBs under PMGSY-III, batch-I of 2021-22, for which Pre-EC meeting was conducted on 18th August 2021. The same was treated as examination of proposals as there were many anomalies in the DPRs. 216 out of the 220 roads were falling under T7 traffic category which was observed to be a statistical anomaly. State was asked to re-conduct the traffic survey and come up with the fresh proposals .
- iii) The current proposal is the fresh proposal for 475 roads of length 4079.69 km at an average cost of Rs. 77.94 lakh/ km and 73 LSBs at an average cost of Rs. 6.07 lakh/ km.
- iv) Of the current proposal, 398 roads of 3154.04 km are proposed with 3.75 m width at an average cost of Rs. 69.31 lakh/ km and 77 roads of 925.65 km are proposed with 5.5 m width at an average cost of Rs. 107.36 lakh/ km.
- v) All proposals have been uploaded and scrutinized by the STAs on OMMAS. PTA scrutiny of 15 roads have been done. **State was asked to carry out the PTA scrutiny of remaining proposals before EC meeting.**
- vi) State has uploaded all the proposals on Geo Sadak. NRIDA has audited 128 sample proposals for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III. 24 proposals were identified and flagged for justification/ modification. Compliance submitted by state is under scrutiny.

4. Trace Map Cut- Quality of Roads

- i) It was observed that, only 297 proposals (62.5%) have trace map rank between 1 to 15. As per the experience with NRIDA, generally 80-85% of the works should have trace map rank between 1 to 15. Committee observed that trace map rank is more for many roads. The reason for same was asked from the state. State representative informed that, there are mainly three reasons for the same. Some of the roads with high trace Map Rank have been taken up under other scheme of the state, some are in their design life and some roads have been taken up under Rural Roads Maintenance Policy. As such high priority roads have got exhausted. The same needs to be examined in NRIDA.

5. Existing Surface

- i) It was observed that 16 roads have BT/ CC in <25% of its surface, 17 roads have BT/CC 25-50% of its surface, 38 roads have BT/ CC in 50-75% of its surface and 14 roads have BT/ CC in 75-85% of its surface. NRIDA was asked to examine these 85 roads. Committee observed that

roads with <75% BT/CC surface should not be included in general as they can not possible be through route or Major rural links.

6. High Priority Roads skipped in CUCPL

i) It was observed that, 63 high priority roads have been skipped due to ownership with different department. Committee however observed that these roads should not be skipped until these are being constructed by the owner department; otherwise, they can be included under PMGSY-III. State needs to provide road-wise justification with necessary documents whether they have been taken up for improvement by the respective departments.

7. Sample scrutiny of proposals on Geo Sadak

i) One road (MRL13-Lakshmipur , Raghunathpur , Bajriya Block Boarder To NH28) in East Champaran District was found to have 100% non BT/CC surface. It was observed that, the road is a bypass to Motihari. State mentioned that, during rainy season, this road is used by the villagers. NRIDA also mentioned that trace map suggests facilities on the said road. Committee agreed for inclusion of this road.

ii) One road (MRL08- T01 Nandnagar to T01 Suryagarha via Katehar, Sunderpur Bind toil) in Lakhisarai district has 73.9% non BT/ CC surface. It was observed that the road is parallel to National highway and high percentage of earthen portion. State was asked to delete the road.

iii) One road (MRL21-DIHLAHI TO KALI VIA NAKATI TOLA , RAMPUR DIH) of Darbhanga has 56.3% non BT/ CC surface. The road is parallel to State Highway and is benefitting population already connected by BT Road. The alignment of the road is U-shaped and the road was not observed to qualify the objectives of PMGSY-III. State was asked to delete the road.

iv) One road (T08-BUXAR ITARHI PATH NATHPUR TO BARKAGAON VIA PASAHARA) of Buxar district has good PCI. State mentioned that, the road is high traffic volume road, and the road needs to be strengthened. Committee mentioned that, strengthening without widening is not justified at the current condition of the road with high PCI.

v) One road (MRL32-SAIFGANJ TO SIMRAHA) of Araria district has good PCI. State mentioned that, the said road connects colleges, railway station and is a high traffic volume road. Committee mentioned that, despite more traffic, the condition of road is good. Also, the average cost of the said road is Rs. 83.87 lakh/ km which is very high. State mentioned that, the cost is high, as they are proposing strengthening along with widening from 3.75 m to 5.5 m width. NRIDA mentioned that, this has been allowed for the other states with the condition that the additional cost is to be borne by the respective states. State and NRIDA was asked to examine this road.

8. Distribution of Roads based on Traffic Category

i) During pre-EC held on 18.08.2021, state had proposed majority of the roads with T7 traffic volume. In the current proposal, Of the 398 roads with 3.75 m, 149 roads are in T5 traffic category, 123 in T6, 117 in T7 and 9 in T9 traffic category. Of the 77 roads of 5.5 m width, 18 roads are in T6 traffic category, 48 in T7, 10 in T9 and 1 in IRC 37.

9. Details of current batch of proposals

i) Of the roads with 3.75 m carriageway width, average pavement cost of the following districts were identified as outliers (**more than Rs. 55 lakh/ km**):-

- Bhagalpur- Rs. 66.88 lakh/ km
- Arwal- Rs. 60.33 lakh/ km
- Chapra (Saran)- Rs. 64.13 lakh/ km
- Buxar- Rs. 59.40 lakh/ km
- East Champaran- Rs. 62.51 lakh/ km
- Kaimur- Rs. 59.38 lakh/ km
- Patna- Rs. 64.77 lakh/ km
- Sitamarhi- Rs. 67.32 lakh/ km
- West Champaran- Rs. 72.47 lakh/ km

ii) Of the roads with 5.5 m carriageway width, average pavement cost of the following districts were identified as outliers (**more than Rs. 70 lakh/ km**) :-

- Araria- Rs. 83.94 lakh/ km
- Banka- Rs. 85.66 lakh/km
- Darbhanga – Rs. 97.03 lakh/ km
- Khagaria- Rs. 76.32 lakh/ km
- Kishanganj- Rs. 77.66 lakh/ km
- East Champaran- Rs. 121.67 lakh/ km
- Gopalganj- Rs. 102.76 lakh/ km
- Katihar- Rs. 99.55 lakh/ km
- Madhubani- Rs. 93.31 lakh/ km
- Saharsa- Rs. 76.34 lakh/ km
- Samastipur- Rs. 89.26 lakh/ km
- Supaul- Rs. 85.72 lakh/ km
- Purnia- Rs. 97 lakh/ km
- Vaishali- Rs. 94.64 lakh/ km
- West Champaran- Rs. 96.29 lakh/ km

State was asked to provide road-wise justification for the roads of above flagged districts. In case the pavement cost is high due to aggregate/ transport cost, new technologies such as CTB/ FDR should be used to bring down the cost, increase speed of construction, improve durability and conserve environment.

10. Average Cost Trends (Roads & Bridges)

i) Committee observed that, the average cost of roads & bridges has increased from previous proposal. State mentioned that, this is due to change in Schedule of Rates (SoR). The price of Bitumen, iron, steel, Cement etc. have increased. State informed that there has been increase of around 10% in prices. It was learnt that revision in SoR of the state was announced in the month of December, 2021. Committee asked, if the revision has been approved. State mentioned that RCD, Bihar is responsible for the change in SoR. State was asked to seek the approval of NRIDA for revised SoR before the same can be used in DPRs.

11. Distribution of roads based on Widening to various Carriageway

i) State has proposed for widening of 29 roads from 3 m to 3.75 m carriageway width. State was asked as to how will they do the widening without impacting the quality of compaction of the widened portion. State representative mentioned that, they will do the widening from one side and will adopt Benching method for widening. NRIDA mentioned that care should be taken so that there is no compaction issue due to less width for widening. Adequate provision should be made for excavating the existing pavement, so that roller can enter in the widening portion. NRIDA was asked to check, if the same has been provisioned in the DPR. However, these roads will be better built if undertaken under FDR. Suitable proposal should be made after cost analysis.

ii) It was observed that, out of 29 roads, 9 roads have PCU less than 500. State was asked to retain these 9 roads and then widening on only 20 roads will be required. In any case, it should also be examined if roads with PCU < 500 qualify as TR/ MRL?

12. PCU/ day details

i) It was observed that, some PCU values are inconsistent with input values of zero on OMMAS and the same need correction. State informed that, the same is due to manual entry and will be corrected. Committee asked NRIDA & State to examine roads of 3.75 m width with more than 2000 PCU/ day. They should ideally be widened if PCU > 2000. Revised details should be sent to the Ministry.

13. Pavement Cost/ km wise details

i) It was observed that 179 roads with 3.75 m width have pavement cost more than Rs. 50 lakh/ km and 74 roads with 5.5 m width have pavement cost more than Rs. 70 lakh/ km. Committee observed that the pavement cost is very high in large number of roads. State needs to look into it and adopt alternate technologies like FDR (along with CTB with stabilizers) in these roads so as to reduce the cost, improve durability, speed of construction and reduce environment damage. State has not adopted any technology other than, waste plastics and paneled cement

concrete in their proposal. State needs to increase the length of roads for construction using waste plastics.

ii) Committee mentioned that in the roads of traffic category T7, T8, T9 and IRC 37, FDR technology will certainly be economical. The same will also be economical for lower traffic categories in case of widening, where additional aggregate is to be used. Committee suggested that, all the roads proposed for widening may be taken up under FDR methodology. Jharkhand, Odisha and Uttar Pradesh are a few states which have been able to reduce the cost using FDR technology as well as cement stabilization. The state should send team to UP and AP and understand how these states have tackled various issues in adoption of a new methodology. Committee asked the state to revise the proposal and adopt FDR technology.

iii) State mentioned that, the villages are very densely populated and the movement of big machinery is very difficult in those areas, hence execution of FDR technology is very difficult. Committee mentioned that, the width of the machinery for FDR is not that big, rather it's size is almost similar to other machinery used in construction of roads. Further, state was asked to do the rate analysis / estimation of the works carried out under FDR and get the SOR approved from Ministry. State mentioned that, they will do a preliminary exercise of rate analysis with the help of UP's rate analysis and send it to the Ministry/ NRIDA.

iv) State mentioned that they have also analysed the roads with high pavement cost, and they have found that some roads have long ago completed their design life and the thickness of crust is not left that much. Hence, state had to adopt multiple provisions and the pavement/ cost has increased. Also, in central and south Bihar, black soil is there, hence using FDR technology in these areas would not be feasible. State mentioned that, they will adopt FDR technology in Northern Bihar, where it is feasible. NRIDA was asked about the complications of adopting new technology in black soil. NRIDA informed that, the process of adopting cement stabilization in black soil would be different. It may require two stage treatment. State was advised to adopt new technologies on maximum possible roads. State requested the visit of some officials of MoRD/ NRIDA to the state for physical verification and guidance to the state. Dir(T) was asked to organize additional webinar for Bihar and Jharkhand.

v) State mentioned that, there is a lack of guidance in the state regarding new technology. After proper guidance, they will come up with proposals under new technology in the next batch. Committee mentioned that many webinars have been organised with the state, still the engineers are ignorant about the new technology. Other states including J&K where accessibility is very less, are doing very well in adopting new technology. State mentioned that they too are willing to adopt new technology and they will send the rate analysis by next month. For DPR formation, they will take help of the consultants of UP. On the issue of guidance in adoption of new technology in black soil, **Committee asked the state to take the initiative, contact the technical experts and fix the dates for webinar. NRIDA will provide the necessary assistance.**

vi) Committee mentioned that, there are many technologies other than FDR like nano technology, cement stabilisation, soil stabilisation for which rate analysis is available, experts are available all across, but still have not been adopted by the state. **It was made clear to the state, that such high-cost proposal can not be accepted in this form and the state needs to take the initiative and consult the experts.**

14. Non-Pavement Cost/ km wise details

i) Non-Pavement cost was also found to be high for many roads. State was asked to provide road-wise justification for all the roads for which non-pavement cost is more than Rs. 25 lakh/km.

15. DPR Issues

i) State was asked to provide a copy of SLSC approval, MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats and consent letters of Hon'ble MPs on final proposal. State informed that, they have submitted the same.

ii) State needs to certify that the roads proposed in the current batch are not PMGSY roads under design life.

iii) State was asked to get done the 3rd party traffic verification adopting ATCC for traffic considered more than 1 MSA as per recent advisory. Reports of the same should be attached with the DPRs. State informed that, they have submitted the reports of ATCC survey.

iv) State was asked to ensure that the design stage Road Safety Audit has been done for all the proposed roads of length more than 5 km and the reports should be attached with the DPRs ensuring appropriate compliance to the recommendation made in the report. State informed that, the same has been attached in all the DPRs.

v) It was observed that, transect walk photographs and summary have not been found attached to the DPRs. State informed that, the same have been attached in the revised DPRs.

vi) It was observed that in maximum DPRs, the test results for GSB materials are not attached to the DPR. State was asked to attach the same.

vii) It was observed that, the quantity of earthwork (cutting) is on very higher side in some DPRs. NRIDA was asked to share the list of roads with the state and state needs to check it again and provide road wise justification for the same.

viii) It was observed that, in some of the DPRs, the CBR of the existing crust is less than 5%. As per IRC SP:72 2015, the existing crust should be stabilised to achieve a minimum design CBR of 5% in order to use the design catalogue. State informed that, they are adopting sand stabilisation for the same. NRIDA suggested that, instead of using conventional technology on

the layer above the sand stabilisation, state should adopt stabilized sub-base. It will be cheaper than conventional WBM/ GSB.

ix) State was asked to explore the possibilities of FDR and/ or stabilisation technology as mentioned earlier. State may take help of STAs also on the use new technology. Committee mentioned that, FDR technology will be economical in the roads where load is high and traffic category is high or widening is proposed.

x) It was observed that, on existing cement concrete pavement, 100 mm DLC and 160/200 mm PCC M30 grade concrete has been proposed. Committee mentioned that, if proposed CC pavement is on existing flexible pavement, Cell filled concrete/ panelled cement concrete/ white topping may be proposed to economise the cost of construction. Provision of 100 mm DLC and 160/200 mm PCC M30 grade concrete needs to be eliminated.

xi) Widening of CDs proposed in many of the DPRs and cost of widening is almost equal to new construction cost. State needs to explore possibility of widening on one side in order to save the cost of one side wall and wing wall/ return wall/ approach wall. State mentioned that road safety audit will be an issue in one-sided widening. Further, one sided widening is taken in less wide road. The roads where full width is there, two sided widening is adopted. NRIDA mentioned that, in case the state is doing widening on both the CD and road work, state should explore the possibility of eccentric widening of CD so that road safety is not compromised. In other case, state may adopt concentric widening.

xii) State has made provision of dry lean concrete sub base for Rigid pavement. State was asked to replace it with GSB to achieve economy. State informed that, they are adopting dry lean concrete only under panelled cement concrete and not conventional cement concrete. NRIDA should examine this.

xiii) State has proposed pucca side drain, the cost of which is on higher side. State was advised to confirm if it is proposed as per the recommendation of road safety auditor and is as per actual site requirement. State was asked to mention the location and size of drain proposed in the DPR and the drainage plan should also be attached with the same. State confirmed that the provision is as per the recommendation of road safety auditor. State was further asked to rationalize the furniture cost as per the actual site requirements.

xiv) State was asked to examine and retain the CDs and culverts of good condition. Repair should be opted for the same.

xv) NRIDA mentioned that the state has proposed the gravel shoulders on both sides for a width of 1.2 to 1.6 m with thickness more than 150 mm. State clarified that, they have provisioned for earthen shoulder and not gravel shoulders. NRIDA should check the same.

xvi) It was observed that, Crash barrier has been proposed in some of the DPRs and the cost of the same is on the higher side. State was asked to attach the clear colour photographs of that particular location to justify the same. State informed that the crash barrier has been proposed on the recommendation of the road safety auditor.

16. R&D Proposals

i) State has adopted only waste plastics and panelled cement concrete under new technology. Length under plastic waste needs to be increased substantially to atleast 50-60% of the whole proposal as plastic waste is easily available in the state and it has a beneficial effect in water resistance of the road.

ii) State has adopted 73 roads for construction using waste plastics and 215 roads using panelled cement concrete. All CC roads should be undertaken in new technology.

iii) Surface dressing should be adopted for roads upto T5, and around 50% for roads in T6-T8 categories.

17. Maintenance

i) State has provisioned Rs. 364.0954 crore as 5 years Routine Maintenance Cost which is 11.45% of the construction cost. This was observed to be on higher side. Ideally, it should be between 7-8%. Committee mentioned that, the construction cost itself is very high due to transportation of aggregates etc. State needs to reduce the maintenance cost.

18. Physical Progress

i) It was observed that out of 169 roads sanctioned under PMGSY-III, only 8 roads have been awarded by the state. State informed that agreement details of 10 works have been uploaded and 42 works have been awarded, agreement details of which is yet to be uploaded. Committee mentioned that, it's been more than a year since sanction of these works; the works should have been awarded by now. State mentioned that the award has been delayed due to issue of higher specification (BM&SDBC). State was asked to award the works at the earliest. State was asked about the surface provisioned in the current batch. State informed that, OGPC with seal coat has been provisioned. State was further asked if they have provisioned surface dressing in T5 traffic category roads. State confirmed the same. NRIDA was asked to check the same on OMMAS.

19. Maintenance Abstract

i) State was asked about the maintenance fund received during the last year and the current year. State informed that Rs. 98.18 crore was received in the current year. However the same is not being reflected as the month is not closed on OMMAS. State further mentioned that, in the integration of OMMS and eMarg, a request was made to NRIDA for changing the mapping of PIUs of two districts namely Nalanda and East Champaran. Motihari PIU is being reflected as

East Champaran on OMMAS. NRIDA had suggested the state to shift this after 31st March 2022. NRIDA informed that, despite multiple notices and timelines, state has not made the corrections. State was asked the reason of not getting the entire maintenance fund of Rs. 156.39 crore. State mentioned that, the funds are received in installments, and due to many conditions of the finance, total funds couldn't be received.

ii) It was observed that, state has not incurred much expenditure on maintenance. State informed that much expenditure could not be incurred because routine inspections and performance evaluations have been missed. State was asked to improve the frequency of RI and PE and incur the expenditure.

iii) State was asked to update the renewal data on OMMAS.

20. eMarg

i) It was observed that, 3% of the total packages are pending for locking on OMMAS, Routine Inspections have been missed in 2406 (54%) roads. 5848 (76%) packages are pending for payment for more than 3 years. 2949 (50%) packages are pending for first payment. State was asked to improve the progress on eMarg.

21. Quality

i) Out of 815 ongoing packages, labs have not been established in 47 packages. State needs to take it up after identifying these packages.

ii) Only 66 SQMs are empanelled against the requirement of 135 (including RCPLWEA). State needs to empanel the required SQMs

iii) Against the target of 5801 SQM inspections, state has so far conducted 5397 inspections (including RCPLWEA). State has shown good progress in conducting SQM Inspections.

iv) During March, 2019 to February 2022, 12293 inspections have been carried out by SQMs. Of these works, 4.43% of the completed works, 7.11% of the ongoing works and 20.56% of the maintenance works have been graded as Unsatisfactory.

v) During March, 2019 to February 2022, 1816 inspections have been carried out by the NQMs. Of these works, 12.15% of the completed works have been graded as Unsatisfactory, 12.06% of the ongoing works have been graded as Unsatisfactory and 30.94% of the maintenance works have been graded as Unsatisfactory. State needs to look into the quality aspect and guide their PIUs as the unsatisfactory grading reported by NQMs is alarming and not in sync with the grading reported by SQMs. Since PIUs are accepting the reports of NQMs, it means their reports are fine. State needs to look into the quality of SQM inspections.

vi) 81 ATRs of NQM Inspections for ongoing works and 36 ATRs for completed works are pending with the state. State needs to submit these ATRs at the earliest.

vii) 3 complaints are pending at State level during the financial year 2021-22. Complaint was forwarded to State Government vide letters dated (i) 18.11.2021, 15.02.2022 (ii) 09.11.2021, 15.02.2022 and (iii) 02.03.2022. State needs to submit their comments at the earliest, so that complaints can be disposed off.

viii) **Anomalies of SQM Inspections**

- i. Camber seems to be negligible, doesn't mention about the inadequate camber, as from the photograph it is clearly seen that there is not elevation gap at the edge of carriageway. Package no. BR02R-803
- ii. Inappropriate way of checking the BT layer as no pit has been excavated, just measured from the edge of carriageway which in turns seems to be eroded. Package no. - BR10R376
- iii. The work has been done till WBM G-III stage, but it can be seen that proper compaction and rolling is not done as edges are seems to be dropped and erosion of materials could be witnessed. QM format is not at all filled properly, major adequate items are unfilled by SQM. Package no. -BR-11R-058
- iv. In Gopalganj district, No photographs are uploaded for all the SQM inspections inspected in the month of February, 2022.
- v. Settlement could be seen on the portal of Hume pipes, if not stabilized the structure, it would be collapsed. The purpose of Cross Drainage is not fulfilled. SQM has given Satisfactory for the same. Package no. - BR14P2R-03

State should sensitize their SQMs to reduce such anomalies and ***ATR of these anomalies should be submitted before EC meeting.***

ix) **SQM Analysis :-** Some SQMs have been identified who have given 0% Unsatisfactory/SRI, even after conducting several no. of inspections. Committee observed that, inspections are not being carried out in order. State needs to look into it and follow up with the individual SQM. It will bring substantial improvement in the quality of roads.

22. Finance

i) An incorrect expenditure of Rs. 49.08 crore has been booked under "Special Works-Repairing of Completed PMGSY roads damaged by extra-ordinary calamities etc." State informed that around Rs. 29 crore out of this 49 crore has been corrected. State was asked to correct the remaining amount also.

ii) It was observed that, the State has not submitted the Audited Balance Sheet of Maintenance Fund and interest verification certificate for FY 2020-21. State needs to submit the same at the earliest.

iii) State has not submitted the PMGSY financial reconciliation report. State was asked to submit the same at the earliest.

v) It was mentioned that, State budget is not being reflected in PFMS TSRY-07 report in 60:40 ratio. State needs to look into it.

vi) Fund release from Treasury to SN Account is not being shown in PFMS SNA-06 report. State needs to look into it.

vii) Interest recovery of Rs. 22.76 crore is pending from bank. State should make efforts to get the interest recovered.

viii) 76 works pending for financial closure for more than 180 days as on 28-03-2022. State was asked to dispose of these pending financial closures.

The State was asked to furnish the compliance report on the observations of the Pre-Empowered Committee urgently so that the proposal could be placed before the Empowered Committee at the earliest.

Meeting ended with Vote of Thanks to and from the chair.
