

No. P-17024/13/2020-RC (FMS No 370883)

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

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 20th March, 2020

Minutes

Sub: Minutes of the Pre Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) submitted by the State Government of Kerala for the year 2019-20 (Batch-I)- regarding.

A copy of the Minutes of the Pre Empowered Committee Meeting held on 18th March, 2020 to discuss project proposals for Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action.



(Lalit Kumar)

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India

Tel. No. 011-2338 2406

Distribution:

- (i) The Principal Secretary, Government of Kerala, Secretariat, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala-695001.
- (ii) The Chief Engineer, Local Self Government Department, Government of Kerala Secretariat, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala-695001.
- (iii) The Chief Engineer, KSRRDA, Kerala.
- (iv) All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5th Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110066.

Copy to:- PPS to Secretary (RD)/ PPS to AS (RD)/PPS to AS&FA/PPS to JS (RC).

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 18th MARCH, 2020 AT 11:30 AM TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF KERALA UNDER PMGSY III (BATCH I), 2019-20

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (EC) was held through Video Conference on **18th March, 2020 at 11.30 PM** under the Chairpersonship of Additional Secretary, Department of Rural Development & DG, NRIDA to consider the proposal of the State of Kerala under PMGSY III (Batch I) of 2019-20. Following officials were present in the meeting.

| | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Smt. Alka Upadhyaya | Addl. Secretary (RD) |
| Dr Ashish Kumar Goel | Joint Secretay, (RC), MoRD |
| Miss Mamta | Joint Director (RC), MoRD |
| Shri. B C Pradhan | Director (Tech), NRIDA |
| Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul | Director (F&A), NRIDA |
| Shri I.K.Pateria | Director (PIII), NRIDA |
| Shri Harsh Nisar | Data Scientist, NRIDA |
| Miss Tanupreet | Deputy Director, NRIDA |
| State Govt. Representatives | |
| Smt. Sreela S | Chief Engineer (i/c), KSRRDA |
| Shri Anil Kumar N | Executive Engineer, KSRRDA |
| Shri Pantaleon KJ | Executive Engineer, KSRRDA |
| Shri Geethakrishnan K I | Asstt. Exe Engineer, KSRRDA |
| Shri Arun Chandran | Financial Controller, KSRRDA |
| Shri S.L. Praveen | IT Nodal Officer, KSRRDA |

2. Current Proposal by the State:

A detailed presentation on the proposal of PMGSY III, (Batch I) of 2019-20 submitted by the State of Kerala was made by NRIDA before the Pre-Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:-

Length (in km), Cost (Rs in Crores)

| Item | As per State's proposal | | | | As per OMMAS dated 17.03.2020 | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| | No | Length | Cost | Avg. Cost/ km (Lakhs) | No | Length | Cost | Avg. Cost/ km (Lakhs) |
| Roads | 112 | 621.14 | 536.24 | 86.33 | 47 | 256.05 | 216.56 | 84.58 |
| Total | 112 | 621.14 | 536.24 | 86.33 | 47 | 256.05 | 216.56 | 84.58 |

***MoRD Share: Rs. 129.62 Crore**

State Share: Rs 86.94 Crore

PMGSY III Target: 1,425 Km

Sanctioned: - Nil

Only 19 roads of 99.49 kms at the average cost of Rs.83.20 lakhs/km were scrutinized by STAs on OMMAS. RQI length has been wrongly entered on OMMAS (57.82 kms) which needs to be corrected. State has informed that some LSBs on roads considered in this batch will be submitted in next batch.

3. Planning Issues:

| Equity | <p>It was informed that the state is coming in a piece-meal manner as and when blocks are clearing the process.</p> <p>Action: The state to submit a tentative Block/District level target distribution to ensure equitable distribution in PMGSY-III. Possible suggestions for the same are to divide the roads according the Rural Road Plan Length in the Block/District with special emphasis or relatively poorer regions of the state. Plan to be submitted before EC.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|-------|--------|------------|-----------|--------|------------|---------|----------|-------|----------|-----------|
| Aspirational Districts | <p>Wayanad is an aspirational district in Kerala. The SRRDA has to ensure adequate targets are allocated to the District and each block is saturated.</p> <p>Action: Submit the same in the plan on actionable above.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inadequate Planning and Prioritisation | <p>The following Blocks have not followed the guidelines for planning with regards to selecting continuous candidate roads and mapping of habitations in the 3 km area. The Blocks need to re-do the habitation mapping satisfactorily, regenerate CUCPL and ensure proposals are in priority. The SRRDA is also requested to study the remaining roads in the new CUCPL and submit in writing whether they'll be proposed or exclude them from their login. The SRRDA has to ensure none of the blocks in the remaining batches have habitation mapping issues or the blocks will be dropped from the batches in which they are being proposed to re-do their entire planning exercise. The SRRDA is requested to put in the adequate checks and balances and train their staff to ensure the same before finalizing candidate roads for a Block.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>District</th><th>Block</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Idukki</td><td>Kattappana</td></tr> <tr> <td>Kozhikode</td><td>Tuneri</td></tr> <tr> <td>Malappuram</td><td>Wandoor</td></tr> <tr> <td>Kottayam</td><td>Lalam</td></tr> <tr> <td>Thrissur</td><td>Anthikkad</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State has to ensure none of these issues arise in the blocks that are coming in the second batch.</p> | District | Block | Idukki | Kattappana | Kozhikode | Tuneri | Malappuram | Wandoor | Kottayam | Lalam | Thrissur | Anthikkad |
| District | Block | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Idukki | Kattappana | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kozhikode | Tuneri | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Malappuram | Wandoor | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kottayam | Lalam | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Thrissur | Anthikkad | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discontinuous and Unsatisfactory Candidate Road Preparation | <p>The selection of candidate roads in the state has been found to be highly unsatisfactory as they do not adhere to the spirit of the guidelines.</p> <p>The PIUs have combined unnecessary/discontinuous alignments for reaching the 5 km candidate road limit. The PMGSY guidelines mention that the candidate roads have to be 5 km preferably and that provisions will be made for Kerala to bring the system limit to 3 km.</p> <p>The state further submitted that certain Blocks didn't receive any target because of the candidate road limit in system and the same will be rectified now.</p> <p>Candidate Roads can only be linear and continuous, discontinuous candidate roads are not permitted.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>Actions:</p> <p>OMMAS will allow Candidate Roads to be 3 km and above for the State of Kerala when second batch CUCPL is generated.</p> <p>SRRDA to request for opening of candidate roads in Blocks where it wants to add new candidate roads in light of the above policy.</p> <p>SRRDA has to ensure that discontinuous/ineligible candidate roads are deleted from the Blocks which weren't covered in the first batch.</p> | | | |
| Y/T/ Discontinuous Proposals | <p>Kerala SRRDA has to do 100% verification of the current proposals to ensure the proposed alignments are linear and continuous. This will inevitably lead to variation in length being proposed. No Y/T or discontinuous alignments are permitted in proposals and the additions need to be removed. Examples were demonstrated in the presentation showcased in PRE-EC.</p> <p>Action: An ATR report shall be submitted by SRRDA with detailed-proposal wise the alignments on satellite, and the lengths actually proposed and the modifications done to adhere to the guidelines. This shall be submitted before the EC.</p> | | | |
| Individual Cases | Individual cases which need to be inspected and appropriate action to be taken by SRRDA before the PRE-EC. | | | |
| | District | Road | Remark | Action |
| | Wayanad (Mananthavady) | T02-Vellamunda-Pulinjal-Mothakkara-Athikolly-Thottolipadi road | Road is being upgraded while the central surface might not require scarification as the weighted PCI is 2.71 | DPR to be re-scrutinized by SRRDA. Shri. Thomas, EX-NQM will securitise the DPR after corrections made by the State. |
| | Wayanad (S. Battery) | T03-Manjappara-Nellarachal-Malaichamkolly road | Road is being widened while the central surface might not require scarification. | DPR to be re-scrutinized by SRRDA. Shri. Thomas, EX-NQM will securitise the DPR after corrections made by the State. |
| | Kozikhode (Melady) | MRL12-Anjampeedika Kayaladu Nedumpoyil Arikulam | 100% Earthen Road being proposed parallel to a MDR. Further, the proposal is 1.9 Cr/km. | The PRE-EC prima-facie requested the SRRDA to re-visit the importance of such a road and drop the same if necessary. |

4. DPR observations

- i. State needs to provide Copy of SLSC approval, MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats and Mandatory certificates duly signed by the competent authority.
- ii. All rural roads should be designed for a minimum sub grade of CBR 5% as per IRC:SP:72:2015. Sub-grade soil should be improved using stabilization techniques.
- iii. Overlay thickness over existing BT layer should be proposed as per Clause 2.2.3 of IRC:SP:72:2015. However, the State has proposed GSB and WBM layers after removal of existing structure.
- iv. Design stage Road Safety Audit details needs to be provided for the roads proposed more than 5 kms length.
- v. State needs to ensure that the required land width is available to provide 9 m top width as per IRC guidelines. Further, State should ensure that the existing CDs are widened to 9 m width.
- vi. WBM should be restricted to 3.75 m/ 5.50 m. No offset is required in WBM layers.
- vii. All existing CDs proposed for reconstruction. Existing good CDs needs to be retained and if required repairs can be proposed. Cost of CDs is on the higher side.
- viii. Concrete shoulders proposed in Alappuzha, Kollam , Palakkad districts needs to be deleted.
- ix. Drain proposed without sound justification. A detailed drainage plan needs to be attached.
- x. Protection works proposed invariably in all roads due to land issues. Protection works should be proposed only in vulnerable portions and should be justified with L and X section drawings.
- xi. Credit should be given to the hard rocks and it may be used for protective works.
- xii. These roads are existing roads and gradient corrections may not be required for entire length. In case, gradient corrections/Profile corrections proposed in majority of road length, the SE/CE should certify the necessity after site investigation.
- xiii. Provisions for Bailing out water charges, Ring bund and diversion roads made for small CD works and needs to be deleted.
- xiv. As per IRC:119 Metal crash barrier required only on bridge approach and embankment height more than 3m.
- xv. The road furniture cost is on higher side especially in Wayanadu, Kannur districts. Needs to be rationalised.
- xvi. Utility shifting charges need to be provided from the State.

5. Maintenance

Committee agreed to the State's proposal of Rs. 1,761.46 lakh (8.13% of the construction cost) for 5 years routine maintenance cost. However, State has to increase 6th year renewal cost to 18-20% against the present proposal of Rs 1,687.07 lakh which is only 7.7% of the construction cost. 6th year renewal cost for 19 proposed roads is not uploaded on OMMAS. 5 years maintenance cost after 6th year's renewal needs to be included by the state.

6. R & D Proposals

State has proposed 27.91 km (10.9 % of length) using Cold Mix Technology, Cement Stabilization and waste plastic under Main Streaming Technology and 47.3 km (18.47% length) using Coir Technology and Nano Technology for water proofing under IRC Accredited Materials/Technologies as per New Technology Initiative guidelines.

7. Status of Agriculture Marketing Reforms

State reportedly does not have the APMC Act. However, Committee asked the State to provide the updated Agriculture Marketing Reforms status in the State.

8. Plantation

Planting of fruit bearing and other suitable trees, on both sides of the roads would mandatorily be taken up by the State by using funds under Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme and other Central and State Schemes as stipulated in PMGSY-III Programme Guidelines. Guidelines on Tree Plantation along Rural Roads (IRC:SP:103-2014), published by Indian Roads Congress should be followed for plantation of trees along the roads constructed under PMGSY-III.

9. Progress of PMGSY works

State has completed 3,147.9 km against the target of 3,327.6 km under PMGSY I. Under PMGSY II, State has completed 473.5 km against the target of 588.9 km. State was asked to complete the balance road length within the targeted time period. State has 30 road works of 85.37 km pending for more than 4 years. State has connected 402 habitations out of 404 feasible habitations. For 2019-20, State has achieved 111 km as on 17.03.2020 against the target of 266 km and was suggested to complete another 100 km by 31.03.2020 as promised by the State. Details of progress of the state as per OMMAS are as under:

Roads (km)

| SCHEME | SANCTIONED | | COMPLETED | | BALANCE ROAD LENGTH | UNAWARDED OF BALANCE LENGTH |
|----------|------------|----------|-----------|----------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | Nos. | LENGTH | Nos. | LENGTH | | |
| PMGSY I | 1,380 | 3,327.56 | 1326 | 3,147.88 | 153.29 (54 Nos.) | 4.87 (2 Nos.) |
| PMGSY-II | 152 | 588.89 | 114 | 473.53 | 110.74 (38 Nos.) | 15.01 (4 Nos.) |

Bridges (No.)

| S.No | SCHEME | SANCTION (NOs.) | COMPLETED (NOs.) | BALANCE (NOs.) |
|------|----------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | PMGSY I | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2. | PMGSY-II | 2 | 0 | 2 |

Layer-wise Length (km) – In-progress Road

| SCHEME | In Progress Sanction Length | Preparatory Work | Earthwork Subgrade | Sub-base Preparation | Base Course | Surface Course |
|----------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| PMGSY-I | 183.410 | 123.813 | 113.713 | 87.912 | 71.580 | 40.584 |
| PMGSY-II | 144.799 | 126.340 | 111.486 | 78.147 | 72.759 | 51.111 |

10. Maintenance

State has incurred Rs 9.23 crore against the requirement of Rs 17.43 crore (53% wrt maintenance fund required) on routine maintenance during 2019-20 which is inadequate and needs enhancement. However, no maintenance fund has been credited to SRRDA during 2019-20 and state was advised to take up the matter with the Finance Deptt. of the State.

11. e-Marg:

Progress of the State onboarding e-Marg is slow. Out of 332 total workable packages, 96 are freezed and 67 have been locked. Manual expenditure entered against 31 packages only and payment of Rs 11.46 lakh is made. Against 125 contractors, only 34 are registered so far. State was advised to expedite the onboarding e-Marg as it will be used for monitoring of maintenance contracts for roads under PMGSY III and all manual payment will be discontinued after 01.04.2020.

12 Quality:

Out of 77 ongoing packages, lab has not been established for 9 package of which 4 are more than six months old. Out of 301 completed and ongoing works, 27 works have not been inspected by SQM even once. 6 ATRs of Completed works and 17 ATRs of Ongoing works are pending with the State which should be submitted by 31.03.2020. Unsatisfactory grading is 19.15% for completed works, 12.68% for ongoing works and 17.41% for maintenance works. This needs attention of the State to bring U grading down to the national average.

13. Finance Issues:

Committee observed that State has outstanding liabilities under Programme Fund which will be cleared in this financial year as reported by the State. State also has to pay attention on the following financial issues and resolve them:

- i. Non Submission of Audited Balance Sheet of Maintenance Fund Account.
- ii. Auditor has pointed out that Fixed Assets register has not been maintained.
- iii. No reply has been received for Financial observation sent to the state.

14. Pre- Empowered Committee suggested the state to send the compliance on all the observations mentioned in the foregoing paras so that EC meeting for sanctioning of the proposal could be conducted at an early date.

15. The meeting ended with vote of thanks to the Chair.
