

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

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

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 08th September, 2022

To

The Secretary, Rural Development Department,
Government of Maharashtra,
Bandhkam Bhawan, 7th Floor,
25, Marzban Road, Fort Mumbai- 400001

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

Sub: Minutes of Pre-Empowered Committee meeting held on 25th August, 2022 at 12:00 Noon to consider the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Maharashtra under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III), (Batch-1, 2022-23) -reg.

Sir,

I am directed to enclose herewith the minutes of Pre-Empowered Committee meeting held on 25th August, 2022 at 12:00 Noon to consider the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Maharashtra under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III), (Batch-1, 2022-23).

2. The State Government is requested to furnish compliance on all the observations of Pre-EC on priority.

Yours faithfully,
M M Kumar
(Lalit Kumar)

Deputy Secretary to the Government of India

Copy to:

- i. All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5th Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110001.

Copy for information to:-

PPS to AS (RD)

MINUTES OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 25TH AUGUST, 2022 AT 12:00 NOON TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF MAHARASHTRA UNDER PMGSY-III, (BATCH-I, 2022-23)

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (RC) was held through Video Conference on 25th August 2022 at 12:00 noon under the Chairmanship of Additional Secretary (RD) & DG, NRIDA to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Maharashtra under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) (Batch-I) of 2022-23. The following officials were present in the meeting:-

Dr Ashish Kumar Goel	Additional Secretary (RD), MoRD & DG, NRIDA
Shri Devinder Kumar	Director (RC), MoRD
Shri B C Pradhan	Consultant/Director (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Aggarwal	Director (Projects-I), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Dr. I.K.Pateriya	Director (Projects-II&III), NRIDA
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri K.T. Patil	Secretary, MMGSY
Shri Sambhaji Mane	Chief Engineer, PMGSY
Shri Pravin Jain	Financial Advisor, PMGSY

2. Details of Proposal

The current proposals of the State Govt under PMGSY-III, Batch-I of 2022-23 are as under:-

As per OMMAS as on 23.08.2022				
Item	Nos	Length (in km/ m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)
Roads	560	3403.25	2750.92	80.83
LSBs	-	-	-	-
Total	560	3403.25	2750.92*	80.83
*MoRD Share: Rs. 1642.83 Cr. State Share: Rs. 1108.09 Crores				
Target: 6550 Km Sanctioned: 2925.922 Km Balance: 3624.07 Km				

3. General Observations

All proposals have been scrutinised on OMMAS by STAs. The scrutiny of proposals is yet to be carried out by PTA. State should conduct 10% PTA scrutiny of all the proposals on OMMAS on priority and certainly before the EC meeting.

The State of Maharashtra has submitted proposals for 560 road works of 3,403.25 km. Out of 560 roads, 530 roads of 3191.82 km length have been proposed with 3.75 m carriage width with average cost of Rs. 78.52 lakhs/km and remaining 30 roads of 211.43 km length have been proposed with 5.50 m carriage width with average cost of Rs. 115.69 lakhs/km.

It was observed by Pre-EmPOWERED Committee (PRE-EC) that in case of 5.50 m carriageway width roads, average cost of Rs. 115.69 lakhs/km is much more than Rs. 96.12 lakhs/km of PMGSY-III sanction of 2020-21. Moreover, in last Pre-EC, the average cost was Rs. 69.03 lakhs/km in case of 3.75 m carriageway width roads, and Rs. 106.67 lakhs/km in case of 5.5 m carriageway width roads. Total average cost in last Pre-EC was Rs. 71.48 lakhs/km. Thus, it has been observed that the average cost of the present proposal both in case of 3.75m C/W and 5.50m C/W is much higher than the average costs of previous Pre-EC. NRIDA should examine this issue in detail and bring out the specific reasons, why it is so.

4. Trace Map ranking

Min. Trace Map Rank	Numbers of Proposals	%
1 to 15	340	61%
16 to 50	146	26%
51 to 100	56	10%
> 100	18	3%
Total	560	

**All proposals lower than Trace Map rank 50 needs to be justified by the State. 74 proposals which lower ranks are much more compared with other states. It is possible that such proposals might have high non-BT/CC portion.*

5. Planning Audit (Proposals)

- i. Out of a total number of 560, 542 proposals are uploaded on GEOSADAK.
- ii. Planning Team from NRIDA was also deputed to SRRDA from 28.03.2022 to 30.03.2022 and verified all the proposals. State has removed 56 roads from earlier proposals having planning issues. Total 553 Sample proposals were audited by NRIDA for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III & out of which justification for 32 proposals has been asked for and 16 proposals have been flagged for modification. State should do the needful.
- iii. From the sample trace maps, in some of the examples, the following observations were made: -
 - a. The road, parallel to existing BT road is not benefitted any habitations (MRL15-ACHIRNE ARULE). The alignment and Kutcha portion is required to be verified or alternatively proposal should be deleted.

- b. The road, parallel to MDR-11, is not benefitted any habitations (MRL26-ADARKI BK. TO HINGANGAON). Proposal is required to be deleted.
- c. The road is mining road. State confirms the mining activity along the road (MRL05-TEURWADI DUNDAGE KUDANUR TO KHANATTI). Proposal is required to be deleted.
- d. The proposal length is greater (36% of new construction) than eligible length (MRL10-SH265 TO ANJANKHED-SELU-KARANJI-WAIPHANY). This is required to be verified.
- e. 87 % new construction and there is no enroute habitation. Benefitted habitations are already connected with BT road and this road is also parallel to existing BT (MRL02-MDR-37 TO KHEL DESHPANDE MANATRI KH). Proposal is required to be deleted.
- f. 81 % new construction and there is no enroute habitation. Benefitted habitations are already connected with BT road and drawn length is 2.15 km (MRL05-ODR-146 (SOMTHANA) TO KHALEGAON ROAD). Proposal is required to be deleted.
- g. 59% Non-BT/CC/WBM road is proposed. Further, the proposal is not in linear alignment and same needs to be modified (MRL04-SH 60 NAGAON K KUMATHE TO SH 60). Left portion is required to be deleted.
- h. Discontinuous candidate road. The proposed alignment and Candidate Road alignment is not matching (MRL04-AAHERWADI-MDR 10- NAWAKI- SH 249- SURLWADI- DEGAON). The candidate road is less than 5 km. Whether the bridge of 50 m length would be required?

The state was asked to re-check these roads and justify as to how they meet PMGSY -III objectives. NRIDA to examine these issues in detail and comment. The state must upload the proposal on Geo-sadak.

6. Proposal checks

It was also observed that in 22 proposals, proposed length is more than the eligible length and the variation is more than 15%. Each of such proposals should be checked and corrected. The justification may also be given. State was asked to ensure that non-eligible (PCI>3) length is not being proposed under PMGSY as the same is not eligible.

7. Proposals with good existing surfaces

2 proposals (Rahata (MRL05) & Mokhanda (MRL05) with good existing surface have been proposed for upgradation. Roads having PCI >3 are not eligible under PMGSY-III. State was asked to either drop these roads or give road -wise justification with geo-tagged videos and cost economy. State was also asked that the DPRs should be verified at the SRRDA level. SRRDA should scrutinize at their level and submit video of proposed alignment.

8. Surface wise details of existing roads

Out of total proposed length of 3403.25 km, 247.77 km is track, 71.70 km is gravel/moorum, 893.93 km is WBM, 2146.80 km is BT and 43.04 km is CC. The State mentioned that length under WBM is also the length which has been work out and was earlier BT. It was advised that roads which were once BT, should be categorized at BT only. State should amend the proposal accordingly. Such change will be permitted on OMMAS by NRIDA after getting proper evidence that such roads were constructed as BT.

Pre-EC directed to conduct detailed scrutiny of the roads where brick/track/gravel/moorum/WBM surface is more than 25% of the length; whether these are part of core network and how these roads are eligible to be considered in PMGSY-III. These roads need to be examined critically by the State to ensure that these roads are meeting the objectives of PMGSY-III. NRIDA will examine these roads on satellite map/GIS and see if they are as per PMGSY-III guidelines. How these kutch roads are part of TR/MRL in a developed state like Maharashtra needs more elaboration/justification.

9. High Priority roads skipped in CUCPL

It was observed that several high-priority roads have been skipped citing different reasons. Pre-Empowered Committee advised that State needs to provide necessary documentary proof of 140 roads sanctioned under State scheme and under construction. Leaving out 83 roads due to forest issues, 46 roads due to ownership is with other departments, 175 roads due to land issues can not be accepted. Timeline for PMGSY-III is till March, 2025. Thus, these roads should be included and State should resolve these issues. Prima-facie, planning audit needs to be done properly.

10. Length-wise proposal details

Sl No	Items	No of roads	Total Length in km	Average Pavement cost/ km (in lakhs)	Average Non pav cost/km (in lakhs)	Total average cost/km (in lakhs)
	2.5- 3 km	06*	14.23	52.36	35.28	87.63
	3 to 5 km	195	773.07	53.38	26.90	80.29
	5 km and above	359	2615.95	56.47	24.49	80.96
	Total	560	3403.25	55.75	25.08	80.83

(*) These six roads are having length of 1.47 km, 2.15 km, 2.50 km, 2.535 km, 2.77 km and 2.8 km respectively.

Out of 560 roads, 6 roads are less than 3 Km in length, 195 roads are 3 to 5 Km in length and 359 roads are more than 5 Km in length. Average Candidate road length is 9.35 km and average proposed road length is 6.07 km. **State should justify the inclusion of roads of length less than 5 Km in proposal. They are probably of lower trace map rank and have been**

included due to skipping of high priority roads. They should all be verified on Geo Sadak whether they fulfill the objectives of PMGSY-III. Roads less than 5 km in such large numbers may not be justified to be included in the proposal. Roads less than 3 km should be deleted unless they are exceptionally justified.

11. Distribution of roads based on Traffic category

Distribution of roads based on Traffic Category							
Sl. No	Traffic	3.75 m carriageway width			5.5 m carriageway width		
		No of roads	Total Length in km	Total Average Cost/km (in lakh)	No of roads	Total Length in km	Total Average Cost/km (in lakh)
1	T4	3	21.30	74.96			
2	T5	50	287.00	77.67			
3	T6	414	2467.52	77.33	1	3.84	76.78
4	T7	45	296.80	84.30	3	12.39	95.30
5	T8				1	4.34	85.58
6	T9	18	119.20	91.63	23	159.43	113.35
7	IRC 37				2	31.44	144.52
	Total	530	3191.82	78.52	30	211.43	115.69

It has been observed by Pre-EC that distribution of roads based on the basis of traffic is abnormal in respect of T-6 category. It seems to be a statistical anomaly. There is a huge number of 414 i.e. 78% roads in T6 category which is statistically improbable. State needs to conduct proper traffic survey so as to get proper traffic distribution. State should carry out the axle load survey and traffic survey (ATCC) for all T9 and IRC 37 category roads. In case of 5.5 m wide roads, the average cost of T9 category and IRC 37 road is abnormally on higher side. State should give detailed justification of component wise cost of these roads.

12. Details of roads with pavement cost per km

In 3.75 m carriageway width, 74 roads have pavement cost more than 65 lakh/km and in 5.50 m carriageway width, 18 roads have pavement cost more than 80 lakh/km.

State is requested to examine all the above DPRs of high pavement cost in general and to furnish proper justification along with breakdown details for the same road-wise. NRIDA should also examine the cost of pavement (layer-wise) and find out where it is more and bring out the outliers. New technology solutions, such as Full Depth Reclamation (FDR) and/ or cement stabilization etc, should be adopted to bring down the cost, while improving performance. In general, for all high-cost roads, new technologies should be adopted to bring down the cost.

13. Details of roads with non-pavement cost per km

Most of the roads have very high non-pavement cost. *Detailed justification is required for such abnormal high non-pavement cost. Pre-EC observed that this high non-pavement cost may be due to inclusion of non-BT/CC (Kucha) roads where previous provisions of CD/protection works are absent. State should examine the DPRs in consultation with NRIDA, do field inspections, and suggest ways to bring down the cost.*

14. Details of roads with PCU/day

In 3.75 m carriageway width, 226 roads have PCU less than 500 and 167 roads have PCU between 500 and 750. Thus, total 393 roads in 3.75 m carriageway width have PCU less than 750 which prima facie does not seem to correspond to Traffic category of T6. Justification is required on these roads.

In case of 3.75 m carriageway width road, 10 roads have PCU more than 2000 and in case of 5.50 m width carriageway roads, 1 road has PCU more than 6000.

In both cases of 3.75 m and 5.50 m wide roads, State should identify the roads where PCU/day is more than 2000 and 6000 respectively. *State should examine critically those roads for lane width requirements where PCU/day > 2000 for 3.75 m wide roads.*

In case of 5.50 m wide road where PCU/day > 6000, extra width beyond 5.50 m may be required and as per PMGSY guidelines, State has to bear cost for extra width of road beyond 5.5 m. State should clarify its stand for these roads where PCU/day is more than 6000.

State should revisit both these types of roads and assess possibility of widening for these roads. NRIDA should also check these roads in Geo Sadak.

Independent 3rd party traffic survey and Axle load test survey reports need to be provided where the roads designed with projected traffic more than 1 MSA.

15. Distribution of roads based on widening to various carriageway widths

Pre-Empowered committee observed that the State has proposed widening of 313 roads from 3 to 3.75 m, 15 roads from 3.75 to 5.50 m, and 7 roads from 3 to 5.5 m.

State should clearly indicate the kind of procedure to be followed while doing widening of roads so as to have proper compaction and also explain the methodology of compaction for widened portion, especially for roads of 3 m to be widened to 3.75 m. It was also pointed out that the state should explore the use of cement stabilization with or without mechanized Full Depth Reclamation (FDR) as it will probably be more economical than conventional method, especially for widening of roads and also result in better quality and compaction.

16. DPR Issues

- i. 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.
- ii. State should certify that the roads proposed in current batch are not PMGSY roads which are under design life.
- iii. Clear coloured photographs at 100m interval of road required for surface verification and in some of the DPRs, black and white photographs are attached.
- iv. Third-Party Traffic Survey and axle load survey by adopting ATCC needs to be attached for traffic more than 1MSA.
- v. Transect walk photographs and summary have not been found attached to some of the DPRs.
- vi. Details of existing crust thickness should be attached with the DPR by conducting pit test.
- vii. Most of DPRs typical X-sections of (i.e. Both flexible and CC road) proposed and existing road are not attached with the DPR.
- viii. In most of DPRs, state has proposed replacement and new CD works. State needs to retain the existing culverts by repairing. The State needs to re-assess the requirement as per site condition and rationalise the provisions proposed.
- ix. In most of the DPRs, Non Pavement cost appears to be on higher side. This needs to re-assess the requirement as per site condition and rationalise the provisions proposed.
- x. As per PMGSY-III guidelines, road safety audit should be done on all road with a length of 5 km & more. Road safety provision should be made as per audit report. All proposed road safety items should be marked in the strip plan.
- xi. In some of the DPRs, State has proposed 6th year's renewal cost on lower side. However, as per the guidelines, 6th year's renewal cost should be 18 to 23% of the project cost.
- xii. In some of DPRs, the State has proposed the higher roads furniture cost approximately in the range of 3.5 to 5 lakhs/km. This should be reviewed and proposed based on the road safety auditor's recommendation and site situations.
- xiii. Locations of road safety measures & road furniture should be provided in the road plan with proper justifications.

17. R&D Proposals

State has proposed construction of following roads using green technology as per the following details-

Sl.No	Name of Technology	No of stretches/ roads	Length(in km)	Percentage of R& D roads with respect to total length
A	Main streaming of Technologies			
	Waste Plastics	86	589.15	17.31%
	Sub Total	86	589.15	
B				
	Coir Technology for Subgrade improvement	18	95.73	35.63%
	Surface Dressing	106	586.27	
	Roller Compacted Concrete Pavement	15	122.34	
	fly ash subgrade	2	9.47	
	Gravel with Slag	1	7	
	Iron Slag for Subgrade improvement	1	5.5	
	Geotextile for Subgrade improvement	3	23.46	
	Lime Stabilization	21	145.87	
	Cement Stabilization	31	202.51	
	Sub Total	198	1212.78	
C				
	Nanotac	2	10.65	2.52%
	Zycosoil Nanotechnology	1	5.050	
	Nano Technology for Water proffing	11	41.64	
	Mechanical Stabilization	1	5.900	
	CMR Bitplast Wet Process	3	22.6	
	Sub Total	18	85.84	
D				
	Other Technologies	10	73.86	2.17

- State has proposed 586.27 km of length using Mechanised Surfacing Dressing, However, the length of BT potion with Traffic $\leq T5$ category is **305.82 km** and **T6 to T8** is **2691.88 km**. As per the vision document, State must propose 100% length below T5 category and 50% length between T6-T8 Traffic category roads using Mechanized Surface Dressing.
- State has not proposed Cold Mix Technology. State must propose 25% of the total eligible proposed length using Cold Mix Technology as per New Technology Vision 2022.
- State has not proposed waste plastic in 70% of the eligible length involving Hot Mix.

- State should propose Panelled Cement Concrete/ Cell Filled Concrete in place of RCCP.
- On 7 roads, State has proposed both Surface Dressing as well as OGPC with Seal Coat, same needs to be rectified.
- **The State was further asked to ensure the following: -**
 - i. State must sign MoU with Technology Provider and NRIDA before physically starting the work for Performance Evaluation in all these cases.
 - ii. State needs to provide performance evaluation reports of earlier sanctioned works and the roads have been completed. No interim reports have been received so far.

18. Maintenance

The State has proposed a 5-year routine maintenance cost of Rs. 222.9799 crore which is 8.1% of construction cost and 6th year renewal cost of Rs. 631.1683 crore which is 22.94% of construction cost. State has been advised that the 6th year's renewal cost should be accompanied by a post 5-year routine maintenance period and such cost should be a part of the DPRs.

19. Progress of PMGSY Works

Annual physical target of the State is 2000 Km, out of which, only 145 Km has been completed. State still needs to complete balance target. State assured to complete the target by March 2022. The details of work sanctioned, completed, and pending under PMGSY-I, II & III and RCPLWEA are given below.

Roads

Scheme	Sanctioned		Completed		Balance		Un-awarded	
	Nos.	Length (Km)	Nos.	Length (Km)	No. of Roads	Length (km)	No. of Road	Length (km)
PMGSY I	5,610	24,782.91	5,563	24,087.60	47	130.945	0	0.00
PMGSY II	385	2,618.91	384	2,585.91	1	1.61	0	0.00
PMGSY III	430	2,925.92	0	53.16	430	2,872.75	3	21.99
RCPLWEA	46	619.68	13	238.48	33	381.19	0	0.00
Total:	6,471	30,947.42	5,960	26,965.16	511	3,386.50	3	21.99

LSBs

Scheme	Sanction (Nos.)	Completed (Nos.)	Balance (Nos.)	Unaward (Nos.)
PMGSY I	685	660	25	0
PMGSY II	108	108	0	0
PMGSY III	-	0	0	0
RCPLWEA	108	56	52	0
Total:	901	824	77	0

Out of the total works sanctioned under PMGSY-I, II & III, 3 roads remain un-awarded as on date. State needs to expedite the tender process of these works. State has mentioned that under PMGSY-I & II, 14 roads and 5 bridges will be completed by 30th September 2022, 21 roads and 6 bridges will be completed by 31st December, 2022 and 7 roads and 5 bridges will be completed by 31st March, 2023. State has also mentioned that remaining 6 roads and 9 bridges under PMGSY-I & II have been proposed for deletion/foreclosure. **During the meeting, it has been reiterated that the Govt. of India will not bear the liabilities under PMGSY-I & II created after September, 2022.**

20. e-Marg

Out of total 507 packages pushed to e-MARG, 41 (8 %) packages are pending for locking, 61 (12%) packages are pending for manual entry expenditure (MEE). 79 roads are eligible for routine inspection in July, 2022, 38 roads (48%) are pending for routine inspection (RI) missed. 279 packages are pending for payment for >3 months. 124 (44%) packages are pending for payment for first payment for > 3 months. Payment of Rs.7.17 crore has been done using e-MARG in FY 2022-23. Total expenditure of Rs. 0.96 crore has been done on bills having liability of FY 2022-23, out of total expenditure of Rs. 7.17 crore using e-Marg. The above position is not satisfactory. The State should take necessary steps to increase DLP expenditure on roads due for maintenance in 2022-23. There should be visible progress on e-Marg before EC meeting.

21. Maintenance of roads under DLP

During 2021-22, against the liability of Rs. 31.73 crore, expenditure of Rs. 27.03 crore has been done. For the current financial year 2022-23, the maintenance liability is 20.70 crore and as on 23.08.2022, the expenditure is Rs. 0.96 crore only. State has not updated/credited any amount in SRRDA's account from 2020-21 to 2022-23. Therefore, State was asked to intimate/update the fund released to SRRDA under DLP during the above-mentioned periods.

No renewal has been done during the last year. The renewal target for this year is 1000 km. The State has not updated renewal length and expenditure data on OMMAS. The same is required to be done immediately.

22. Award analysis

Out of total 427 awarded works under PMGSY-III, 28 works have been awarded at -30% below than the sanctioned cost, 44 works at 24-30% below the sanctioned cost, 60 works at 18-24% below sanctioned cost, 88 works at 12-18% below sanctioned cost, 61 works at 6-12% below sanctioned cost, 28 works at 0-6% below the sanctioned cost and 118 works are awarded at cost above the sanctioned cost **The State was asked to ensure additional visits of State Quality Monitors on the low quoted PMGSY works so that these works are completed with good quality, in terms of advisory dated 3rd March, 2022 issued by NRIDA.**

23. Quality

(a) Out of 478 ongoing packages, QC labs have not been established in 77 packages. There are 64 works which have not been inspected even once. These should be inspected immediately and certainly before EC meeting.

(b) Number of active SQMs are 104 against requirement of 55 SQMs. During 2022-23, 3093 SQM inspections are targeted and till date, 224 inspections have been conducted. State was asked to expedite pace of inspection to achieve the target.

(c) 17 ATRs are pending at State Level. State should show substantial compliance for these pending ATRs before they come for EC meeting.

(d) Unsatisfactory grading by NQM from August, 2019 to July, 2022 for completed works is 11.76%, for ongoing works it is 9.79% and for maintenance works it is 22.50%. The unsatisfactory grading by SQM during the same period for completed works is 4.35%, for ongoing works it is 0.80% and for maintenance works it is 17.84%. Thus, the quality grading awarded by the SQM is abnormally low when compared to grading awarded by the NQM.

Unsatisfactory grading by NQM from August, 2021 to July, 2022 for completed works is 0%, ongoing works, it is 12.12% and for maintenance works, it is 50% as compared to quality grading of 0%, 1% and 20.93% for completed, ongoing and maintenance works respectively by the SQM.

The State was asked to review the performance of active SQMs on priority and take action against the defaulting SQMs.

(e) 01 complaint is pending at State level during the financial year 2021-22 & 2022-23 which is required to be resolved at the earliest.

(f) Some anomalies noticed in SQM inspections are as under: -

- i. Maintenance road has been graded as Satisfactory by uploading only 1 photograph which is of information board (Package no. MH1251, MH0177). No scheme name has been given in the board. (Package no. MH0740)
- ii. Completed road work has been graded as satisfactory without checking base layer. Inspection report is also not uploaded for this work (Package no. MH0354)
- iii. For maintenance road, pavement surface is eroded but given satisfactory grading (Package no. MH1711)
- iv. Information board is rusted but that has been graded satisfactory (Package no. MH2542)

- v. Thickness of layers has been taken without excavating pit of standard size (Package no. MH3154, MH1683, MH0180).
- vi. In surface layer, edges of road are badly damaged but the same has been graded as satisfactory by SQM (Package no. MH0557)
- vii. No description has been given in the photos uploaded (Package no. MH09139).

State was advised to take immediate corrective action and show some improvement in the aforesaid issues and furnish the ATR before EC meeting.

24. SQM Analysis

It was noticed during the meeting that SQMs empanelled by the State have graded very few works 'Unsatisfactory' out of the large number of projects inspected by them. The State was advised to scrutinize and find out whether the performance of such SQMs satisfactory.

25. Financial issues

- a. Interest verification certificate has also not been submitted for FY 2004-05 to 2009-10 and 2020-21.
- b. State has not submitted audited balance sheets of administrative expenses and maintenance fund.
- c. Interest recovery of Rs. 3.58 Cr. is also pending for recovery from Bank.
- d. State has not submitted PMGSY financial reconciliation report.
- e. Financial closure of 7 no of works is pending for more than 180 days as on 23.08.2022. The State may take immediate action and expedite pending financial closure of completed works.

The State was asked to look into these financial issues and take appropriate action.

26. 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 possible.

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