

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

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


Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
Dated the 6th October, 2020

MINUTES

Sub: Minutes of the Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III, submitted by the State Government of Maharashtra for the 2020-21 (Batch-I)-reg.

The undersigned is directed to enclose herewith the minutes of the meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee held on 21st September, 2020 (Monday) at 12:30 PM to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Maharashtra for the year 2020-21 (Batch-I) under PMGSY-III.

2. It is requested that a compliance report on all the observations of the Committee may be sent to the Ministry/NRIDA.


(Anurag Bhatnagar)
Assistant Commissioner (RC)
Tel: 011-23381343

Distribution:-

1. Shri P.M. Kide, Secretary (MMGSY), Rural Development Department, Government of Maharashtra, Bandhkam Bhawan, 7th Floor, 25, Marzban Road, Fort, Mumbai-400001, Maharashtra.
2. The Chief Engineer (PMGSY) & Empowered Officer (MRRDA), Maharashtra Rural Roads Development Association, Govt. of Maharashtra, New Administrative Building, 3rd Floor, Opposite Council Hall, Camp, Pune-411001, Maharashtra.
3. The Chief Executive officer, Maharashtra Roads and Bridges Development Board, Room No. 214, Second Floor, Maharashtra Civil Secretariat-II, Sector-9, Chandigarh, Maharashtra.
4. All Directors, NRIDA.

Copy for information to:-

- Sr. PPS to Secretary (RD)/PSO to AS & FA/PPS to AS (RD)/PPS to JS (RC) & DG.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 21st SEPTEMBER, 2020 12:30 PM TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF MAHARASHTRA UNDER PMGSY-III, (BATCH-I, 2020-21)

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee (RC) was held through Video Conference on 21st September, 2020 at 12:30 PM under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary (RC) & 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 2020-21. Following officials were present in the meeting.

Dr Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary (RC), MoRD & DG, NRIDA
Shri Devinder Kumar	Director (RC), MoRD
Shri. B C Pradhan	Consultant (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agarwal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Dr. I.K.Pateriya	Director (P.II&III), NRIDA
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri Pravin Kide	Secretary MMGSY
Shri SR Katkade	Chief Engineer, MMGSY
Shri Chandrakant Jawale	SQC
Shri Shafee J Sayed	ITNO
Shri PN Wagh	SE PMGSY, Nashik
Shri DV Pisolkar	SE PMGSY, Aurangabad
Shri Rajesh Patil	SE, PMGSY Konkan
Smt Ansari	SE, PMGSY Nagpur

2. Details of Proposal

Item	As per State's proposal dated 21.09.2020				As per OMMAS dated 21.09.2020			
	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)	No	Length (in km/m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)
Roads	190	1,432.90	1,210.97	84.51	190	1,432.90	1,210.97	84.51
Total	190	1,432.90	1,210.97	84.51	190	1,432.90	1,210.97	84.51
*MoRD Share : Rs. 725.51 Crore					State share : Rs. 485.46 Crore			
Target: 6,550 km					Sanctioned : 0.00 km			

3 m width road - 9 Nos & Length - 51.85 km - Rs. 78.65 Lakhs/km
 3.75 m width road- 168 Nos & Length - 1,273.45 km - Rs. 83.29 Lakhs/km
 5.50 m width road - 13 Nos & Length- 107.61 km - Rs. 101.80 Lakhs/km

State has uploaded - 372 roads – 2,860.90 km – Rs. 2,096.19 Crore - Rs 73.27 lakhs/km. Planning Audit has not been done for all districts. This should be completed much before EC. State has wrongly mentioned RQI length of 597.82 Km in OMMAS. State should rectify the same.

The State of Maharashtra has been allocated a target of 6550 km under PMGSY-III. The current batch of proposals comprises 190 road works measuring 1432.90 km. Out of 190 roads, 9 roads measuring 51.85 km are of 3.00 m width, 168 roads measuring 1273.45 km are of 3.75 m width and remaining 13 roads measuring 107.61 km are of 5.50 m width. The average cost of roads of 3.00 m width is proposed to be Rs 78.65 lakh/Km, that of 3.75 m is proposed to be Rs 83.29 Lakh/Km and 5.50 m is proposed to be Rs 101.80 lakh/Km by the State Government. All the proposals have been scrutinized by STAs. **PTA has not scrutinized any proposals on OMMAS. At least 10% of DPRs should be scrutinized by PTA. High cost DPRs should be scrutinized and examined by PTA. This should be done before EC.**

Traffic wise details of road

- i. In 3/3.75 m carriageway width, 16 roads of length 102.91 km are in T5 category with average cost Rs 75.11 lakhs/km (average pavement cost Rs. 51.74 lakh/Km).
- ii. In 3/3.75 m carriageway width, 153 roads of length 1142.93 km are in T6, T7&T8 category with average cost Rs 82.94 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 60.06 lakh/Km).
- iii. In 5.50 m carriageway width, 08 roads of length 69.81 km are in T6, T7&T8 category with average cost Rs 90.20 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 68.63 lakh/Km).
- iv. In 3/3.75 m carriageway width, 07 roads of length 73.95 km are in T9 category with average cost Rs 87.52 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 63.48 lakh/Km).
- v. In 5.50 m carriageway width, 05 roads of length 37.80 km are in T9 category with average cost Rs 123.23 lakhs/Km (average pavement cost Rs. 88.10 lakh/Km).
- vi. In 3/3.75 m carriageway width, 01 road of length 5.50 km is in > 2 MSA category with average cost Rs 208.67 lakhs/km, **designed with 3.6 MSA** (average pavement cost Rs. 167.80 lakh/Km).

Pre EC observed that in 01 road work of 3/3.75m width of carriageway, detailed justification for adopting design 3.6 MSA along with traffic survey is required. How can such road be of 3.6 MSA. The road is to be seen on the map and it needs to be ascertained as to what population and facilities it is serving. Cost of road, 208.67 lakh/km is abnormally on the higher side. Similarly, 7 roads in 3.75m category are in T-9 category, which does not seem to be justified. This seems odd that 3.75 Km road is proposed in T-9 category. Detailed breakdown of cost is to be intimated by the State along with traffic survey report. It is also observed by Pre EC that average cost of all categories of roads is on higher side as compared to PMGSY-II sanctions. Detailed justification is required on these counts.

Out of the total proposal of 1432.90 Km of roads, 207.83 km is from track level, 50.49 km from Gravel level, 153.32 km from WBM level, 702.60 km are BT & CC roads. **State should justify high quantity of track/gravel/WBM roads and as to how they are classified as MLR/TR.**

3. Trace Map Quality

Trace Map Rank	Number of Proposals	%
1-15	134	71
16-50	35	18
50-100	18	9
100+	3	2

More than 89% of roads have been proposed from higher trace map rank. Reasons for selecting 18 roads with low trace map rank is required from the State with alignment map of all these 18 roads and its UV with detailed justification.

4. Planning

(a) The length-wise proposal

Details of length wise proposals are as under: -

S.No	Items	No of roads	Length in km
1	Less than 3 km	8	17.67
2	3 to 4 km	13	43.99
3	4 to 5 km	14	59.26
4	More than 5	155	1311.99
	Total	190	1432.90

State has considered 155 No of roads > 5 Km and 35 No of roads < 5 Km. Average Proposed Length of road is 7.54 km. State has to confirm whether these roads which are less than 5 Km in length are part of longer candidate roads, which are more than 5 Km in length and also examine their UV and justify its inclusion in proposal.

(b) Target Allocation to Districts

The State of Maharashtra has DRRP length of 2.5 Lakh Km. Target of PMGSY-III is 6550 Km which is 2.6% of total DRRP length. Pre-EC observed that there is no uniform allocation of target to various districts of states. **State needs to explain what strategy has been adopted by them for allocation of targets to various districts.**

(c) Planning Audit

- i. As per NRIDA advisory, all districts should get their planning audited before starting DPR to avoid waste of resources. State should finish checking utility value, PCI and CUCPL generation before preparation of DPR.
- ii. 17 Districts were submitted for Planning Audit and 98 Blocks were checked. 43 Blocks were flagged to the State for corrections regarding habitation mapping out which 17 have submitted proposals in this batch. State should expedite the same.

- iii. 6 Blocks have not rectified the problem satisfactorily & have submitted proposals based on CUCPL not adhering to guidelines. 2 Blocks have proposed based on old priorities only. Remaining 26 Blocks have not submitted proposals in this batch and have not satisfactorily corrected their CUCPLs. State should rectify the balance.
- iv. 9 Districts (40 Blocks) submitted proposals without sending CUCPL for planning-audit. State to submit CUCPL for audit before starting DPR work.
- v. State to do habitation mapping again and bring proposals based on new CUCPL in upcoming Batch.
- vi. Bandhana and Gondia districts have brought proposal based on old CUCPL and have to propose higher priority roads before the current DPRs.
- vii. SRRDA to scrutinize the DPR because as per PIU majority of the existing surface is having PCI>2. Cost is still on the higher side, despite higher PCI.

5. DPR Issues

- i. State needs to provide copy of SLSC approval, mandatory certificates and MOU for maintenance duly signed by the competent authority.
- ii. Hon'ble MP's consent letter as per Ministry's advisory dated 02.06.2020 along with MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats duly signed by the competent authority should be provided by the State.
- iii. Certificate that no PMGSY road has been proposed in current batch within the design life of 10 years should be provided by the State.
- iv. 23 number of sample DPRs were received, scrutinised and 17 DPR observations communicated to State on 20.09.2020 by NRIDA. State should to expedite reply on the same.
- v. Average cost per Km is on higher side when compared to PMGSY-II sanction. Component wise cost needs to be justified. Width of road taken (especially for widening) should be justified on the basis of traffic category/PCU.
- vi. 3rd party traffic survey or axle load survey details needs to be provided wherever roads proposed more than 1 MSA, as per guidelines.
- vii. Design stage Road Safety Audit details needs to be provided for the roads proposed more than 5 km length.
- viii. Proper transect walk photographs, transect walk summary have not been attached to the DPRs.
- ix. Proper details of the Existing crust thickness are not attached to the DPR.
- x. State should propose soil stabilization since in most of the DPRs, CBR reported is less than 5%. The design CBR taken is also less than 5% and designed the Pavement. As per Para 1.6.3 of SP:72:2015, the minimum CBR of subgrade soil for Rural Roads should be 5. (e.g. Package no. MH16114, MH29124, etc).
- xi. In many DPRs, the State has removed the existing crust and proposed pavement right from the GSB layer/subgrade by giving very small credit to the existing pavement materials. The State should propose overlay as per Clause 2.2.3 of IRC: SP:72:2015 to economize the cost of construction. (e.g. Package no. MH0827, MH16114, etc.)
- xii. GSB width for intermediate lane (5.5m) and single lane (3.75m) should be restricted to 5.80m and 4.05m width respectively (e.g. MH2176) and for other crust layers such as WBM/WMM no offset should be given (e.g. MH2989).
- xiii. The test results for GSB materials are not attached to the DPR.
- xiv. Existing/proposed box culverts, slab culverts, causeways portion needs to be deducted in pavement quantity to avoid duplication of quantities.

- xv. The cost of CDs/km for Maharashtra State is Rs 11.41 Lakhs/km whereas the total average for the States sanctioned/considered by EC/Pre EC is Rs 7.31 Lakhs/km. All the CDs need to be designed as per IRC: SP: 20. This issue needs examination in detail as to why cost of CD is on higher side.
- xvi. As per IRC: SP:72-2015, the thickness of the hard shoulder should be 100mm with a width of 1m on each side. (e.g. MH3381, MH0827).
- xvii. The provision and cost of CC roads and Pucca Drainage is on the higher side and drains should be proposed in the habitation area. Drainage plan needs to be attached to the DPR. This should be accompanied by GIS maps, justifying the need for U-drain and CC portion.
- xviii. As per Government of Maharashtra, Revenue and Forest Departments Gazette No 67 Dt. 11 May 2015 that the Royalty charges of Rs. 141.34/cum are being considered. But in DPRs, rates considered for the same is on higher side. State may give clarification on the same and examine the rates included in all the DPRs. (e.g. Package no. MH29111)
- xix. RCC protection wall is proposed without mentioning the proper chainage of the provision. The State needs to reassess the requirement as per site condition and rationalize the provision proposed. (e.g. MH16101 & MH16114) Also cost of CD works, CC works, RCC protection works is on higher side. There is huge difference in average cost of pavement per km and average cost of road considering total cost. State to justify and re-examine the same in consultation with NRIDA. These observations are based on sample DPRs. These should be complied with in all the DPRs.
- xx. The cost towards utility shifting is not permitted from the programme fund. The cost for such provision should come from the additional State share and updated under higher specification.
- xxi. A non-uniform carriageway width of 5.5m and 3.75m have been proposed in the DPR. From the road safety point of view, keeping a uniform carriageway width of 3.75m is recommended. (e.g. Package no. MH0827). This should be checked in all the DPRs.
- xxii. Junctions have not been designed properly.
- xxiii. Labour cess should not exceed 1% of the project cost. State has proposed 2%. Needs correction in all the DPRs (e.g. Package no. MH3381)
- xxiv. DPR preparation charges/Survey Charges considered are on the higher side (around Rs. 50,000/km). It should be as per NRIDA approved rates. (letter dated 19.03.2020). Any additional cost beyond approved cost needs to be born by the State under higher specification.

6. Governance issues at SRRDA

State Government to furnish inputs on following points pertaining to Governance issues at SRRDA/ PIUs: -

- i. Governance related issues like staff strength at SRRDA and PIU level. Whether sufficient staff is available at SRRDA & PIUs. What are the vacancies at SRRDA/ PIUs and how and when they would be filled? Availability of staff should be commensurate with works in hand or anticipated. The execution and management capacity in terms of staff and infrastructure should be explained and justified. If there are any deficiencies, then measures to accelerate them should also be spelt out.
- ii. Strength of technical wing involved in preparation and scrutiny of DPRs proposals- whether sufficient manpower and expertise exists?

- iii. Capability for design and execution of bridge works and their supervision during the construction.
- iv. Mechanism of SQM inspections and availability of expert staff at SRRDA to vet their reports. Whether strength of SQMs is adequate for carrying out required number of inspections as per guidelines, keeping in mind works in progress and new sanctions over the coming years. Separate SQMs should be empanelled for inspection of bridge works.
- v. Forest / Land issues involved in current proposals or previous works in hand.
- vi. System of contracting: How many days SRRDA is taking in award of sanctioned works and what measures is it taking to reduce the time taken for various process: from the date of sanction to actual publishing of NIT, evaluation, award, agreement, and actual start on ground. The state must commit to specific timelines in EC for these processes.

7. Maintenance

State has proposed maintenance cost of 6.08% which was agreed and 6 years Renewal cost of 15.03 % which was not agreed to by the Pre-EC. Needs to be increased to 18% & above. 5 Year routine maintenance cost after 6th years's renewal need to be included in the DPRs.

8. R&D Proposals

State has proposed construction of 59 roads 290.37 km (20.26%) using green technology as per the following details.

SI No.	Technology	No. of Roads	Length of road works
Main streaming of Technology			
1	Waste plastic	59	290.37
Sub-total		59	290.37

20.26% of total road length has been proposed using Main stream technology, against minimum requirement of 10%. No roads have been proposed by using IRC accredited technology against minimum requirement of 5%. The State was advised to propose at-least 5% road length using IRC accredited technologies/material in the current batch. The State Government was also advised to avoid mechanical distribution of R&D targets to the PIUs. It should be strictly as per the requirement of the location. State was also advised to furnish break-up of specific IRC accredited technologies road-wise with justification. 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.

9. Observations on DPRs regarding road safety & RSA reports

State should conduct Road Side Safety Audit from qualified auditors only. Following points observed during scrutiny of DPR:

Item	Observations
Strip Plan	Distance of road side hazards from road edge not mentioned.
Transect Walk	Safety concerns of Community not discussed. (This is important, community must be involved, made aware)
Horizontal Alignment	Horizontal profile in Auto cad missing Curves of 20 m radius and restricted speed of 25 Kmph proposed. Design not checked for safety.
Design of Junctions	Junctions not listed and junction drawings not provided. (these are critical locations for safety)
Road side drain	Details not provided (Distance from edge, covered/ uncovered)
Protective work	W-Beam Barrier is proposed along water body, which should be reconsidered (in the instant case, guard post will suffice and be cost effective and durable)
Embedding Safety measures in DPR	No project road safety provisions discussed Checklist of Road Safety Measures is filled Mechanically. (responses not substantiated by provisions in the DPR). Edge line marking considered only at curves. This is not sufficient from safety point of view and also is against IRC norms.
RSA Report	Design stage road safety audit not conducted i.e design parameters not evaluated for safety. Safety hazards, curves and junctions in the proposed alignment and design provisions for them are not investigated from road safety perspective. Whether safety requirements of all categories of road users are met through design provisions, has not been investigated.

10. Progress of PMGSY Works

Out of 2138 habitations sanctioned for all-weather road connectivity, 1435 habitations have already been provided all-weather road connectivity and 703 habitations are yet to be provided all-weather road connectivity.

The detail of balance works and unawarded works under PMGSY-I, II and RCPLWEA in the State are as detailed below: -

Name of Intervention	Balance works			Unawarded		
	No. of roads	Length (Km)	LSBs	No. of roads	Length (Km)	LSBs
PMGSY-I	119	422	70	09	41	38
PMGSY-II	3	4.91	2			
RCPLWEA	44	599	104	36	454	75
	166	1025.91	176	45	495	113

Total 166 no of road works of length 1025.91 m and 176 No of LSBs are pending with the state to complete. Out of these pending works 38 roads and 15 LSBs are pending since more than 4 years, 13 roads are 3 to 4 years old, 79 roads and 86 LSBs are 2 to 3 years, 36 roads and 75 LSBs are less than one-year-old.

Out of above balance works 45 roads and 113 LSBs are still unawarded. Out of these pending unawarded works 8 roads and 01 LSB are more than 4 years old, 37 LSBs are 3 to 4 years old, 01 road is 2 to 3 years, 36 roads and 75 LSBs are less than one year old.

Most of these works are pending in Gadchiroli and Nandurbar Districts. Progress of these works are badly affected due to LWE activities and forest clearance issues. State Government was asked to take immediate action for clearing pending forest clearance issues for works. In respect of works, which are not feasible due to various reasons, proposals should be sent for dropping of such projects.

11. e-Marg

Progress of the State onboarding e-marg is slow. Out of 99 total workable packages, only 4 have been locked and payment using e-marg has been done only in 1 package. Further, against 55 contractors, only 2 are registered so far. State was advised to expedite the onboarding e-Marg as it will be used for monitoring of maintenance contracts and all manual payment will be discontinued. Progress on e- Marg is quite unsatisfactory as compared to other states and state should bring substantial improvement before EC.

12. Quality.

Out of 146 ongoing packages, lab has not been established for 6 packages, out of which 5 are more than six months old. Further, 90 works have not been inspected by SQM even once, out of these 68 work are more than 12 months old. 3 ATRs of NQM observations in respect of Completed works and 6 ATRs of Ongoing works are pending with the State. Unsatisfactory grading is 10.53% for completed works, 5.43% for ongoing works and 35.33% for maintenance works. The State was advised to take immediate corrective action and show some improvement in the aforesaid before the proposal is considered by the Empowered Committee. A clear action plan to improve quality of works and inspections need to be put in place before the State comes for EC.

13. Financial issues

- (i) Financial closure of 15 physically completed work are pending with the State, Out of these of 15 physically completed works, 10 bills are of more than six months old. The State was asked to take immediate action and ensure completion before EC.
- (ii) State has an unspent balance of Rs 446.70 crore and utilization percentage is only 10.27%. Progress is very slow.
- (iii) Central and state share pending to be released from State Treasury for RCPLWE works as on 18-09-2020 are Rs. 86.95 Cr and Rs. 57.98 Cr respectively. State to take immediate action and confirm.
- (iv) Unreconciled balance standing under Mar 20 balance sheet. State to rectify it.
- (v) Booking under unauthorized head special works-reparation of completed PMGSY roads damaged by extraordinary calamities etc under Mar 20 balance sheet. State to reconcile.
- (vi) Bank interest verification certificate for FY 2019-20 not received.
- (vii) Non submission of OMMAS based audited balanced sheet of maintenance fund for FY 2018-19. State to expedite.

14. 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.
