

Government of India

Ministry of Rural Development

Department of Rural Development

KrishiBhavan, New Delhi

Dated 11th June, 2021.

MINUTES

Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Empowered Committee held on 9th June, 2021 to discuss the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Tamil Nadu under PMGSY-III, Batch-I, 2021-22 -reg.

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Empowered Committee held on 9th June, 2021 under the Chairmanship of Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of India to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Tamil Nadu under PMGSY-III, Batch-I of 2021-22 is forwarded herewith. It is requested that the compliance on the observations of the EC may be submitted on priority so that the proposal could be processed for final approval.


(Lalit Kumar)

Deputy Secretary to the Government of India

Tele No 011-23382406

Email:-lalit.kr@nic.in

Distribution:

1. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development & Panchayati Raj Department, Tamil Nadu, Govt. Fort. St. George, Chennai- 600009.
2. The Director/ Managing Director, Rural Development & Panchayati Raj Department, TNRHIDC, Panagai Building Saidapet, Chennai-600015, Tamil Nadu.
3. The Adviser, NITI Aayog.
4. The DG (RD) & SS, Road, Wing Department, Ministry of Road Transport & Highways Transport Bhawan, New Delhi.
5. The Chief Scientist, Central roads Research Insititue, Mathura Road, New Delhi.
6. The Secretary General, Indian Road Congress, Kama koti Marg, Ranjit Nagar, Sector 6, Rama Krishna Puram, New Delhi.
7. The Secretary Department of Agriculture, Cooperation and Farmers Welfare, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare, KrishiBhawan, New Delhi.
8. All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5th Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi.

Copy for information to:-

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

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 9thJUNE, 2021 TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU UNDER PMGSY-III (BATCH I), 2021-22

A Meeting of the Empowered Committee was held on **9thJune, 2021 at 10.30 AM** under the Chairmanship of Secretary, Department of Rural Development to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Tamil Nadu under PMGSY III (Batch I, of 2021-22). Following officials were present in the meeting.

Shri Nagendra Nath Sinha	Secretary (RD)
Smt. Alka Upadhyaya	Addl. Secretary (RD)
Smt. Leena Johri	Addl.Secretary & FA(RD)
Dr Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA
Shri. B C Pradhan	Consultant (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Dr. I.K.Pateriya	Director (P.II &P.III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agrawal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
Shri Lalit Kumar	Deputy Secretary (RC), MoRD
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri K. Gopal	Principal Secretary, Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department
Dr. K.S. Palanisamy	Commissioner RD & PR, CEO
Smt.R.Rajashree	Additional Director, RD & PR
Shri Kuttalingam	CE, RD&PR
Shri R.Chandrasekar	CE, Highways
Shri A.Sarvanakumar	Superintending Engineer, RD&PR
Shri A.V. Rajesh	EE, RD&PR

2. Current Proposal by the State:

A detailed presentation on the proposal submitted by the State of Tamil Nadu under Batch-I of 2021-22 was made by NRIDA before the Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:-

As per Pre EC dated 18.02.2021					As per OMMAS as on 07.06.2021			
Item	Nos	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)	Nos	Length (in km)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)
Up- Gradation Roads	287	1,302.86	958.05	73.53	281	1,283.09	818.10	63.76
Total	287	1,302.86	958.05	73.53	281	1,283.09	818.10	63.76
*MoRDShare : Rs. 490.86 Crores					State Share : Rs. 327.24 Crores			

- I. The State of Tamil Nadu has been allocated target length of 7,375 Km under PMGSY-III, out of which State has already been sanctioned 3,198.01 km (after dropping of 1 road covering length 3.20 Km) and balance length to be sanctioned to the State is 4,176.99 km. The current proposal is for 281 roads of 1,283.09 Km at an estimated cost of Rs. 818.10 crore (Central Share- Rs. 490.86 crore and State share- Rs. 327.24 crore). All the proposals have been scrutinized on OMMAS by STA and 30 roads (10%) by PTA. The average cost of the proposal is Rs. 63.76 lakh/Km.
- II. Out of 281 roads, the state has proposed 274 roads of 3.75 m carriageway width (1,231.18 km) at an average cost of Rs 61.93 lakh/km and 7 roads of 5.50 m carriageway width (51.96 Km) at an average cost of Rs 106.95 lakh/km.
- III. The Committee observed that the average cost of 3.75 m carriageway width was Rs. 52.59 lakh/km and Rs. 57.82 lakh/km in projects sanctioned to the State under Batch-I, 2019-20 and Batch-I, 2020-21 respectively, which is now proposed in the current batch @ Rs. 61.93 lakh/km. The average cost in r/o 5.50 m carriageway width which was Rs. 68.26 lakh/km and Rs. 92.61 lakh/km in Batch-I, 2019-20 and Batch-I, 2020-21 respectively has been proposed @ Rs. 106.95 lakh/km. Thus, there is huge increase in average cost, especially more so in the case of roads proposed with 5.50 m carriageway width.
- IV. The State has informed that the state is in the process of preparing DPR for 55 LSBs and after due scrutiny from STA/PTA the same would be submitted to MoRD for clearance along with the the next batch

3. Length wise proposal details

Out of 281 roads proposed in the current batch, 13 roads are of 2 to 3 km length, 182 roads are of 3 to 5 km length and 86 roads are more than 5 km length as per the following details:-

Sl. No	Items	No of roads	Length in km	Pavement cost	Cost/km	Total cost in Crores	Average cost/km
1	2 to 3 km	13	32.89	11.59	35.24	19.58	59.53
2	3 to 5 km	182	706.70	253.13	35.82	439.33	62.17
3	5 km and above	86	543.50	209.03	38.46	359.19	66.09
	Total	281	1,283.09	473.75	36.92	818.10	63.76

The average length of candidate road is 7.58 Km and the average length of proposed roads is 4.57 km. Under PMGSY-III, the candidate roads should preferably be of length not less than 5 km. The State has proposed 195 roads of less than 5 km length. The State should submit justification as to how they are MRL/TR and eligible under

PMGSY-III, and whether the length of candidate roads in each of these cases is more than 5Km.

4. Existing surface details

Break-up of the existing surface of roads proposed to be taken up under the current batch is as under:-

Brick soling	Track	Gravel	WBM	BT	CC	Total
-	8.90	5.75	14.08	1,240.45	13.91	1,283.09

The existing surface of large part of the proposal is thus WBM or BT or CC.

5. Traffic wise details of road

i) In 3.75 m carriageway width, 166 roads of 705.17 km are in T4 & T5 category with average pavement cost of Rs. 34.80 lakh/km and average total cost Rs. 63.41 lakh/km.

ii) In 3.75 m carriageway width, 29 roads of 125.60 km are in T6 and T7 category with average pavement cost of Rs. 27.91 lakh/km and average total cost of Rs. 50.90 lakh/km.

iii) In 3.75 m carriageway width, 75 roads of 377.18 km are in T9 category with average pavement cost of Rs. 40.53 lakh/km and average total cost of Rs. 63.20 lakh/km.

iv) In 3.75 m carriageway width, 4 roads of 23.20 Km are in more than 2 MSA category with average pavement cost of Rs. 34.27 lakh/km and average total cost of Rs. 56.25 lakh/km.

v) In 5.5 m carriageway width, 7 roads of 51.95 km are in more than 2 MSA category with average pavement cost of Rs. 32.47 lakh/km and average total cost of Rs. 106.59 lakh/km.

6. Planning

(i) Trace Map Cut-Quality of roads

Min. Trace Map Rank	Numbers of Proposals	%
1 to 15	135	48%
16 to 50	97	35%
51 to 100	35	12%
> 100	14	5%
Total	281	

The Committee was informed that the current batch is the 3rd batch of proposals from the same CUCPL and, therefore, lower ranks in Trace Map cut are on the expected lines.

(ii) Planning Audit

- i. All proposals are uploaded on GEOSADAK.
- ii. 03 proposals were flagged for existing good surface based on the pictures. Of these, the State has dropped 1 road from the current proposal and for the remaining two (02) proposals of widening of roads, geo-tagged photographs/video have not yet been submitted by the State. The State was asked to expedite the same.
- iii. 25 proposals were flagged for low Trace Map rank, etc. of these, 5 proposals have been dropped. The State has provided road-wise justification for the remaining proposals as to how the proposed roads serve the PMGSY-III objectives. In four (04) roads the justifications are not complete. The State was advised to submit justification for these 4 roads also on priority.
- iv. 13 proposals where the proposed road length of length are 2 to 3 Km and which are part of candidate roads of length greater than 5 Km and serve PMGSY-III objectives were flagged with the observation that the proposed length is less than the eligible CUCPL length. The State Government/NRIDA were asked to re-examine these proposals and furnish justification for inclusion of these roads in their next proposal.
- v. Such kind of anomalies should also be examined in the other proposals, where proposed length is less than the eligible CUCPL length.

7. DPR observations

- i. The pavement and non-pavement cost are abnormally high in some districts. The State representative intimated that the DPRs have been reworked based on site inspections and the cost has been reworked wherever required and reduced by Rs. 127.28 crore after Pre-EC meeting. It was also informed that there has been increase of 4-6% in the SoR, which is also a factor for the increase in average cost over the previous batches.

The State representative attributed the higher non-pavement cost to higher number of RCC culverts, causeways, side drains, protection work, etc. and added that the above provisions are required as per field conditions. It was also informed that the non-pavement cost also includes GST and LWF, which is 13% of the project.

The Committee after detailed deliberations decided that the proposals with abnormally high pavement and/or non-pavement cost should be set aside for now for deeper technical scrutiny by the NRIDA and only such proposals which are within the permissible/rational limit of road safety requirements, should be taken up for further approval as of now to expedite approval process. Rest of the proposals can be put up, if found fit, after proper re-examination and amendment as required. *NRIDA team should also be deputed to visit some of the project sites where the proposed cost is very high.*

It was also decided to compute GST and LWF both for pavement and non-pavement components separately and add the same at the relevant head, as is done for other states.

- ii. State should provide MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats and consent letters of Hon'ble MPs on the final proposal.
- iii. State should provide road-wise length (and location) of stretch where the required land width is not available to provide 7.50 m and 9.00 m top width (roadway width) for 3.75 m and 5.50 m carriageway width roads. They should compute as to what proportion of proposal is affected due to this.
- iv. State has proposed 4 roads of 16.20 km only using surface dressing, despite having a large number and KM of roads with low volume traffic. The State representative assured that the State would propose more roads length (at least 50%) with surface dressing on roads designed with T5 and below traffic category in the current batch. It was made clear that sufficient awareness about this technology has been given by NRIDA and sufficient equipment for mechanized surface dressing is available in the country, and it is a technology which reduced construction cost significantly.
- v. The State has proposed about 82 Km using Stabilized sub base and base using chemical stabilizer. As regards proposals using FDR Technology, the State representative intimated that the State is not in the know-how of the technology and the contractor in the state currently does not have the required skill/machinery to take up such works. It was mentioned that FDR will be useful and economical in the state as there are many districts where the transportation of material has to be done over large distance. The State representative assured that the roads using FDR technology would be proposed by the state in the future batches in sufficient length.

8. Maintenance

State has proposed 5 years routine maintenance cost of 6.09% and 6 years Renewal cost of 18.90%, which are agreeable. 5 years maintenance cost after 6th year renewal needs to be included in the proposal.

9. R & D Proposals

State has proposed 103 roads of 405.79 km using various new technologies as indicated below:

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			
1	Waste Plastic	31	116.25	9.06%

	Sub Total	31	116.25	
B	Other Main Streaming technologies			
2	Cement Stabilization	32	133.03	11.57%
3	Surface Dressing	4	15.40	
	Sub Total	36	148.43	
C	IRC Accredited Technology			
4	CMR Bitplast	6	17.22	11.00%
5	Nanotechnology Water proofing	8	43.68	
6	RBI Grade 81	6	24.94	
7	Coir Technology	11	42.03	
8	Terrazyme	5	13.24	
	Sub Total	36	141.11	
	Total	103	405.79	31.63%

State was asked to propose more length using Waste plastic and Cold mix. The State representative assured that low volume roads will be proposed under surface dressing for at least 50% length, and FDR technology in future batches of proposals as indicated in para-7 above.

State should also propose balance length (326.97 km) using Coir technology in next batch in terms of NRIDA's letter dated 23.04.2020 (Target: 369 km). State should confirm Nano technology water proofing are not only proposed in BT layer. Nano technology only in Tack coat and BT layer is not encouraged due to lack of evaluation methods as yet.

State has proposed 27.13 km with CC pavement. State was advised to propose some length using Cell Filled Concrete/ Panel Cement Concrete.

10. Governance Issues

I. As per OMMAS, State has 28 active SQMs against the total requirement of 89 SQMs. The State was asked to empanel more number of SQM for strengthening of 2nd tier quality management.

II. State should also strengthen the Quality Management Cell for proper scrutiny and further follow-up of SQM reports on ongoing, completed and maintenance works.

11. Progress of PMGSY works

The status of implementation of PMGSY-I, II and III in the State are as under:-

Road length in Km

S.No	SCHEME	SANCTIONED		BALANCE		UNAWARDED	
		Nos.	LENGTH (Km)	No. of Roads	Length (km)	No. of Roads	Length (km)
1	PMGSY I	7,678	16,319.53	16	21.03	0	0.00
2	PMGSY II	860	2,940.42	11	7.39	0	0.00
3	PMGSY III	880	3,198.00	798	2,664.54	1	2.36
	Total:	9,418	22,457.95	825	2,692.96	1	2.36

Bridge (No.)

Sl. No	SCHEME	Sanction (Nos.)	Completed (Nos.)	Balance (Nos.)	Unawarded (Nos.)
1	PMGSY I	97	90	07	-
2	PMGSY II	34	32	02	-
3	PMGSY III	0	0	0	-
	Total:	131	122	09	-

The State should take immediate action for completion of pending projects under PMGSY-I and II. As regards one (01) road work which is unawarded under PMGSY-III, it was informed that the same is under re-tendering.

12. Physical Progress 2020-21 (as on 08.06.2021)

112 Km (6%) road length has been constructed against targeted length of 2,000 Km. State should accelerate the pace of execution to achieve the target.

13. eMARG: Onboarding

Out of total 2,521 packages pushed in eMARG, 2,554 packages to be locked, 2,414 packages have been locked, 266 packages (13%) pending for MEE. 226 roads (9%) are pending for registration for eMARG App, 1,809 roads (75%) pending for Routine Inspection (RI), 2,004 road works (83%) are pending for Performance Evaluation (PE), 4,633 bills pending for submission by contractor, 321 packages are pending for payment for more than 12 months and payment of Rs. 26.50 crore has been done using eMARG till date. The state was asked to take action for saturation on eMARG

and ensure that all maintenance payments are made through e-MARG in the current year. Attention should be given as to why bills are pending for more than 12 months.

14. Maintenance Abstract

As per OMMAS, no funds have been released for maintenance of roads during 2019-20 and 2020-21. However, the inputs shared by the State representative with regard to maintenance liability, release of funds to SRRDA by the State and expenditure incurred are as under:-

Financial year	Maintenance funds required	Actual release	Expenditure
2019-20	31.35	17.93	16.27
2020-21	33.74	33.74	26.12
2021-22	41.47	2.38	2.00

The State was asked to update the figures on OMMAS. Further, the attention of State was invited towards the provisions of the programme guidelines, which stipulate that the release of 2nd installment of programme fund in a year shall be subject to submission of, among others, a certificate from CEO of SRRDA that maintenance funds required as per maintenance contracts in force had been spent during the previous financial year. For release after May of a year, the certificate should also include that 50% of such maintenance funds requirements for the current financial year have been released by the State, whereas for release after November the certificate should be for 100% of such funds. The State's attention was also invited towards Ministry's advisory dated 12th January, 2021 on the subject and the State was advised to take immediate corrective action to ensure interrupted flow of funds for execution of the projects sanctioned under PMGSY.

15. Renewal Length status (km)

The State has not updated renewal data on OMMAS. The State representative was asked to ensure updation of renewal data and expenditure on OMMAS.

16. Quality Control - 1st& 2nd tier

I. Out of 816 ongoing packages in progress, quality control lab details have not been uploaded in r/o 22 packages.

II. 20 works of 6-12 months old have not been inspected even once. Of these, payment of more than Rs. 10 lakh has been made on 3 works. State's attention was invited towards advisories issued by the NRIDA in this regard and the state was asked to ensure compliance of the advisories. The State was also asked to get these works inspected by SQM on priority.

III. 28 SQMs are in position against the requirement of 89 SQMs. The State was asked to increase the number of SQMs for strengthening of 2nd tier quality management.

IV. Against the target of 4,480 SQM inspections during the current financial year, only 145 inspections have been carried out so far. The pace of SQM inspections should be increased to achieve the targets.

V. **Anomalies of SQM Inspections during Jan'21 to May'21 :-**

- No tests were conducted on completed road package No. TN1138, only general photographs are uploaded.
- Inadequate size of pit taken only for checking BT layer thickness on road package No.TN5124.
- Camber not checked properly. Camber plate placed without marking centre line of road.(Package No. TN04208).
- Photograph of Lab uploaded indicates, unequipped lab on project package No.TN0388.
- Incorrect method used for measurement of longitudinal gradient on package No.TN0388.

17. Quality Issues-3 tier

i. **Unsatisfactory % based on NQM inspections (May'2018-May'2021)**

- Completed Works - 1.91% - 209 Completed works inspected
- Ongoing Works -2.35% - 680 Ongoing works inspected
- Maintenance works - 11.59% - 302 Maintenance Works Inspected

The State was advised to focus on maintenance works.

ii. **Pending ATRs at State level-**

- Ongoing Works - 01
- Completed Works - 02

18. Finance Issues:

- i. Audited Balance Sheet of Maintenance Fund for F.Y 2019-20 has not yet been submitted by the State. The same may be expedited.
- ii. The Audited Balance Sheets of Prog. & Admin for F.Y 2019-20 submitted by the State are not OMMAS based, they need to be re-submitted.
- iii. The State has not yet submitted bank interest verification reports.
- iv. The State has not yet submitted reconciliation report of fund received & expenditure. The same may be expedited.
- v. 28 works pending for financial closure for more than 180 days as on 04-06-2021
- vi. Budget provision in the State Budget for PMGSY for FY 2021-22 has not been reflected on TRSY-02 report of PFMS. The same may be done on priority.

19. Empowered Committee recommended the project proposal submitted by the Government of Tamil Nadu as in para-2 above subject to fulfillment of the observations made in the foregoing paras and compliance thereof.

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