

No.P-17024/9/2021-RC (FMS No. 375520)

Government of India

**Ministry of Rural Development
Department of Rural Development**

Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi

Dated the 3rd July, 2023

Minutes

Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) submitted by the State Government of Himachal Pradesh for the 2023-24 (Batch-I)-reg.

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Empowered Committee held on 12th June, 2023 through Video Conferencing to consider the project proposals submitted by State of Himachal Pradesh under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III), 2023-24 (Batch-I) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action. The State Government is requested to furnish compliance on the observations of Empowered Committee on priority.



(Devinder Kumar)

Director (RC)

Tele No 011 2307 0129

Distribution:

- (i) The Principal Secretary, Government of Himachal Pradesh, Nirman Bhawan, Shimla-171002, Himachal Pradesh.
- (ii) The Chief Engineer HPRRDA. PWD Bhawan, Nigam Vihar. Shimla-171002, Himachal Pradesh.
- (iii) The Adviser (RD), NITI Aayog, NITI Aayog Bhavan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.
- (iv) The Director, Central Roads Research Institute, Mathura Road, New Delhi.
- (v) The Secretary General, Indian Road Congress, Kama Koti Marg, Ranjit Nagar, Sector-6, Rama Krishna Puram, New Delhi-110037
- (vi) The Chief Engineer, Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, Parivahan Bhavan, New Delhi.
- (vii) The Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Cooperation and Farmer's Welfare, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers' Welfare, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi, with the request to nominate an officer dealing with the Agricultural Produce and Live Stock Marketing (Promotion and Facilitation) Model Act, 2017 for the meeting.
- (viii) All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5th Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi-110001.

Copy for information to:-

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

Minutes of the Empowered Committee meeting held on 12th June, 2023 at 03:00 PM to consider the project proposals submitted by the State Government of Himachal Pradesh under PMGSY-III, (Batch-I, 2023-24)

A Meeting of the Empowered Committee was held through Video Conferencing on 12th June, 2023 at 03:00 PM under the Chairmanship of Secretary (RD) to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Himachal Pradesh under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) (Batch-I) of 2023-24. The following officials were present in the meeting:-

Shri Shailesh Kumar Singh	Secretary, Department of Rural Development, GoI
Dr Ashish Kumar Goel	Additional Secretary (RD), MoRD & DG, NRIDA
Ms. Tanuja Thakur Khalkho	Joint Secretary & Financial Advisor (RD)
Shri Amit Shukla	Joint Secretary (RC), MoRD
Shri Devinder Kumar	Director (RC), MoRD
Shri B C Pradhan	Consultant/Director (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agrawal	Director (Projects-I), NRIDA
Dr. I.K. Pateriya	Director (Projects-III), NRIDA
Shri Nirmal Bhagat	Director (Finance), NRIDA
Ms. Shalini Das	Joint Director (Tech) NRIDA
Shri J. K. Agrawal	Section Officer (RC), MoRD
State Govt. Representatives	
Shri Bharat Khera	Principal Secretary (HPPWD), Govt of Himachal Pradesh
Er. Ajay Gupta	Engineer-in Chief cum CEO, HPPWD/HPGSDA, Shimla
Shri Deepak Sharma	Engineer in Chief (P)
Er. D.K. Dhiman	Superintending Engineer (WB), HPPWD/HPGSDA
Er. Umesh Sharma	SQC, HPPWD
Sh. D.K. Nag	Executive Engineer (PMGSY)
Shri Bhavesh Chaturvedi	Executive Engineer (PMGSY)
Shri P. Ranjit Dogra	Financial Controller, HPGSDA
Er. Lalit Grover	Executive Engineer (QC &D)
Shri Govind Sharma	Accounts Officer
Shri Arun Chaudhary	GIS Expert

2. Details of Proposal

The current proposals of the State Govt under PMGSY-III, Batch-I of 2023-24 are as under:-

As per Pre-EC (12.04.2023)					As per OMMAS dated 10.06.2023			
Item	Nos	Length (in km/ m)	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost/km (Lakhs)	No	Length (In Km/m)	Cost (Rs. in Crores)	Avg. Cost per km/m (Lakhs)
Roads	244	2565.434	2813.08	109.65	256	2704.334	2662.02	98.44
LSBs	-	-	-	-	14	1034.01	78.55	7.60
Total	244 roads	2565.434 km roads	2813.08	75.84	256 roads +14 LSBs	2704.334 km roads + 1034.01 m LSBs	2740.57	-
MoRD Share: Rs. 2441.58 Crore					State Share: Rs. 298.99 Crore.			
Target: 3125 Km					Sanctioned: 440.183			
					Balance: 2684.817 Km			

State has recently uploaded 14 nos of **Long Span Bridges (LSBs)** on OMMAS. Out of 14 LSB proposals, only 6 LSB proposals have been scrutinized by STA. LSB proposals are yet to be scrutinized by PTA and NRIDA. State needs to get all LSB DPRs scrutinized from STA, PTA and NRIDA. Hence, it was discussed during EC meeting that the State will come up separately with **proposals of LSBs in next batch**. It was conveyed to the State that they should critically check the requirement of LSBs.

3. General Observations-

(i) All proposals have been scrutinized on OMMAS by STAs. 23 road proposals have been scrutinized by PTA on OMMAS which is 8.98% of the total proposals.

(ii) The current batch of proposals is for 256 road works of 2704.334 km length. Out of 256 roads, 217 roads of 2302.664 km length have been proposed with 3.00/3.75 m carriageway width with average cost of Rs. 93.91 lakhs/km and remaining 39 roads of 401.67 km length has been proposed with 5.50 m carriageway width with average cost of Rs. 124.37 lakhs/km.

(iii) State has submitted the proposal of 2704.334 km length. However, State has balance length of 2684.817 km only. **Therefore, State should restrict their proposals to balance allocation.**

4. Average Cost trends (Roads)

During Pre-EC meeting, the Committee observed that the average cost has increased in respect of 3.00/3.75 m width roads from Rs. 95.90 lakh/km at the time of PMGSY-III (2022-23) to 104.48 lakh/km and in respect of 5.50 m width roads, cost has increased from Rs. 88.50 lakh/km at the time of PMGSY-II (2019-20) to 136.06 lakh/km now. In this connection, State was advised to re-examine the cost and intimate whether new SOR has been made effective on above cost or not. They should also examine cost implication (increase) due to GST and new SOR separately. **In this connection, State apprised the EC that SOR has already been approved and the increase in GST @6% has been taken into consideration. Now, the State has submitted revised proposals for 256 road works of 2704.334 km length. Out of 256 roads, 217 roads of 2302.664 km length have been proposed with 3.00/3.75 m carriage width with rationalized average cost of Rs. 93.91 lakhs/km and remaining 39 roads of 401.67 km length with 5.50 m carriage width also with rationalized average cost of Rs. 124.37 lakhs/km.**

5. Trace Map ranking

Min. Trace Map Rank	Numbers of Proposals	%
1 to 15	133	52%
16 to 50	86	34%
51 to 100	25	10%
> 100	12	5%
Total	256	

***Trace Map ranking found to be satisfactory as reported by NRIDA.**

6. Planning Audit (Proposals)

- i. All 256 road proposals are uploaded on GEO-SADAK.
- ii. All road proposals were audited by NRIDA for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III & out of which, 64 proposals were asked for justification and 07 proposals were flagged for modification.
- iii. State has submitted the compliance of Pre-EC observations and 04 road proposals have been shifted from current batch and minor modification in the alignment has been undertaken in 08 proposals. The compliance of Pre-EC's observations are as under: -
 - During Pre-EC, it was observed that Package ID-HP10292 (T04-Jhameria Rama Dhon Daghera) is 100% Non-BT/CC road of 9.3 km road length. **In this connection, State apprised the EC that the said HP10292 (T-04 Jhameria Rama Dhon Daghera) road is 100% BT, which was incorrectly written non BT on OMMAS. The photographs and site visit by NRIDA also verified the same. The surface detail is now corrected on OMMAS.**
 - During Pre-EC meeting, it was observed that the Package ID-HP6164 (MRL10-Bharain road) is also 45% Non-BT/CC road of 7.35 km length. **In this connection, State apprised the EC that the said road has been visited by the team for site verification. The road proposal is independent and in the middle of 2 ends. Further, Ministry of Road Transport and Highway is also making aerial rope-way to connect. Hence, it should be allowed as an exceptional case as informed during the Pre-EC by the Pr. Secy (PW) also.** During the meeting, NRIDA has also apprised the EC that enroute population is being served through this road and it has also been verified on GeoSadak.
 - During Pre-EC meeting, it was observed that the Package ID-HP03178 (T03-Main Road Jandru to Mehali Bridge vai Mehalro) is a link road serving 172 populations only. There is no major habitation and facility along the road. **In this connection, State apprised the EC that the above mentioned road is serving a sizeable population by providing connectivity to diverse facilities i.e. Co-operative Society, Panchayati Raj Institutions and therefore needs to be considered. It was also informed that the road is connecting the adjacent Blocks Tihra Sujanpur and its facilities.** NRIDA also intimated during EC meeting that the above road is a inter-block road, connecting to MDR and the same is verified on Geosadak.
 - During Pre-EC meeting, it was advised regarding Package ID-HP04427 (MRL07-Brehm Theru to Garh Mata Temple) that as per PMGSY-III guidelines (Clause no. 2.1), the MRL can be proposed for connectivity to Agricultural markets, Schools, and Hospitals. The proposed road is ending at a habitation Chakban Pathiar which is considered as link road serving only 77 population. There is no major habitation and facility along the road. **In this connection, State intimated during the EC that the above road has been looked into and has been deleted from the list of current proposals.**

- During Pre-EC meeting, it was observed that the Package ID-HP07155 [MRL10-Rawaling Thirling Mailing (Telangway)]road is ending at a habitation Rewaling which is considered as link road serving only 32 population. In this connection, State reiterated during the EC that the link road is facilitating the habitations of Rewaling Thirling, Mailing, Telangway villages. Following two roads also bifurcate from this road:- (i) link road to village Dhawansha & (ii) link road to mailing temple which is a major tourist destination and having a large tourist football around the year benefiting the local population. It was also apprised by the State during EC meeting that being situated in border area **this road should be considered for upgradation under PMGSY-III as an exceptional case, which was agreed to by EC.**
- During Pre-EC, it was observed that the Package ID-HP07160 (MRL02-Main Road Chowkhang Nainghar Road) is a link road serving a very thinly populated area. **In this connection, State apprised the EC that the above road has been visited and verified by the members of NRIDA team during the site verification. This road is providing access to important facilities and further, due to being located at a very high altitude, the population is scattered along the road. This road connects the village Chambak, Chowkhang, Chhokjang and Nainghar having 419 population. There is a health sub-center and Govt School also. The road is required to be considered under PMGSY III, which was agreed to by EC.**

7. Surface wise details of existing roads

Out of total proposed length of 2704.3 km, 0.8 km is Gravel, 3.30 km is track, 2650.1 km is BT and 50.00 km is CC. Entire proposal is almost 98 % BT/ CC.

During Pre-EC meeting, it was observed that one road has less than 25% and another road has 50-75% BT/CC portion. These two roads need detailed scrutiny. During EC meeting, NRIDA has intimated that surface details for one road HP10292 (T-04-Jhameria Rama Dhon Daghera) has been corrected on OMMAS. The photographs and site has been visited by NRIDA. Now, there is only 01 road having less than 75% of BT/CC existing surface.

8. High Priority roads skipped in CUCPL

It was observed that several high-priority roads have been skipped citing different reasons. 35 roads have been skipped due to length less than limit decided, 31 roads due to under DLP, 18 roads due to land issues, 17 roads due to State scheme DLP, 09 roads due to ownership is with other departments and many other citing different reasons.

During Pre-EC meeting, it was observed that the timeline for PMGSY-III is till March, 2025 and roads with DLP up to 31st December 2023/ March 2024 may be considered under PMGSY-III.

State apprised the EC that the matter was examined and all these 35 roads have been verified on site as well as on OMMAS data. These may not be eligible under PMGSY-III guidelines because of better surface condition. Regarding 9 roads which were skipped due to ownership with other Departments, the CEO has taken up the matter with the concerned Department (RDD) to include them in ongoing schemes. The road were skipped mainly because of following reasons-

- 9 years cycle is not completed
- Entire stretches are earthen
- Land is not available for widening
- Taken up for up-gradation under other schemes.

9. Traffic wise details of roads

In case of 3.00/3.75 m wide road, out of total 217 roads, 04 roads of length 31.17 km are in T4 category with average cost of Rs 82.35 lakh/km, 28 roads of length 240.038 km are in T5 category with average cost of Rs 85.6 lakh/km, 101 roads of length 1128.501 km are in T6 category with average cost of Rs 91.8lakh/km, 73 roads of length 754.785 km are in T7 category with average cost of Rs 99.68 lakh/km, 3 roads of length 44.45 km are in T8 category with average cost of Rs 85.98 lakh/km, 2 roads of length 37.37 km are in T9 category with average cost of Rs 100.88 lakh/km and 6 roads of length 63.69 km are in IRC 37 category with average cost of Rs 101.02 lakh/km.

In case of 5.50 m wide road, out of total 39 roads, 1 road of length 7.17 km is in T6 category with average cost of Rs 109.26 lakh/km, 5 roads of length 71.36 km are in T8 category with average cost of Rs 117.32 lakh/km, 10 roads of length 78.885 km are in T9 category with average cost of Rs 132.67 lakh/km and 23 roads of length 244.255 km are in IRC-37 category with average cost of Rs 124.20 lakh/km

During Pre-EC meeting, it was observed that distribution of roads in various traffic category may not be correct as a large number ie. 162 (79.80%) out of 203 roads were shown in T-6 & T-7 category. In this connection, **State apprised the EC that revisions have been undertaken in its proposal. EC observed that there are still 174 roads (80.18%) out of 217 roads which are in T-6 & T-7 categories. Moreover, ATCC report is yet to be received in NRIDA. State was requested to examine the above and submit the ATCC report to NRIDA at the earliest.**

10. Details of roads with PCU/day

In 3m carriageway width roads, 80 roads have PCU less than 500, 3 roads have PCU between 500 and 1000, 8 roads have PCU between 1000 and 1500, 01 road has PCU between 1500 and 2000.

In 3.75m carriageway width roads, 55 roads have PCU less than 500, 48 roads have PCU between 500 and 1000, 63 roads have PCU between 1000 and 1500, 10 roads have PCU between 1500 and 2000, **07 roads have PCU between 2000 and 2500, 4 roads have PCU between 2500 and 3000 and 2 roads have PCU between 3000 and 3500.**

In 5.5 m carriageway width roads, 1 road has PCU less than 500, 01 road has PCU between 500 and 1000, 01 road has PCU between 1000 and 1500, 01 road has PCU between 1500 and 2000, 13 roads have PCU between 2000 and 2500, 7 roads have PCU between 2500 and 3000, 4 roads have PCU between 3000 and 3500, 01 road has PCU between 3500 and 4000 and 10 roads have PCU more than 4000.

- **EC has observed that State should identify the roads where PCU/day is more than 1500 in case of 3.00/3.75 m wide roads and should examine critically for road width requirement.**

- **3 roads which have been proposed in 5.50 m width with PCU<1500 are required to be examined in detail. Explanation should also be asked from STA for clearing the proposal. The EC advised that if the State wanted to upgrade this road to 5.5m width, then it should bear the extra cost on account of widening.**
- **PCU/day prima facie also did not seem to correspond to the Traffic categories. The EC advised that the State should revisit their recommendations for 3.00/3.75 m and 5.5 m roads vis a vis PCU, and furnish detailed justification. Due to less width of carriageway, the roads with high PCU may become accident prone. Therefore, State and NRIDA should critically examine the PCU for all roads and also assess possibility of widening for these roads. NRIDA should also check these roads on Geo-Sadak.**
- **Independent 3rd party traffic survey and Axle load test survey reports need to be provided where the roads have been designed with projected traffic more than 1 MSA.**

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

Empowered Committee observed that the State has proposed widening of 187 roads from 3 to 3.75 m, 36 roads from 3.00 to 5.5m and 02 roads from 3.75 m to 5.5m.

During Pre-EC meeting, it was observed that widening in hills require hill cutting, which makes slopes unstable, and is also detrimental to ecology/ environment. The State should critically examine whether widening of roads from 3m to just 3.75m is required on the basis of traffic. **The State apprised the EC that the same has been complied and eccentric widening of 0.75m has been proposed. The State also informed that the suggestion of Pre-EC to keep the road 3m instead of 3.75m was examined and incorporated, wherever feasible.**

12. Details of roads with pavement cost per km

In 3/3.75 m carriageway width, 90 roads have pavement cost more than 60 lakh/km. In 5.50 m carriageway width, 35 roads have pavement cost more than 70 lakh/km.

During Pre-EC, State was requested to examine the DPRs of these high pavement cost in general and to furnish proper justification along with breakdown details for the same road-wise. **In this connection, State apprised the EC that the pavement cost has been revised and accordingly, the same has been amended on the OMMAS after the visits of NRIDA teams.**

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

During Pre-EC meeting, it was observed that in most of the DPRs, non-pavement cost appears to be on higher side. This needs to be re-assessed as per site condition/ requirement and rationalize the provisions proposed. **In this connection, State apprised the EC that the pavement cost has been revised and accordingly, the same has been amended on the OMMAS after the visits of NRIDA teams.**

During the Pre-EC meeting, the average cost was 109.95 lakhs/km and now, during EC meeting, the average cost is 98.44 lakhs/km for 2704.334 km. There is a cost rationalization of 303.16 crores in pavement and non-pavement cost.

14. Maintenance

The State has proposed a 5-year routine maintenance cost of Rs. 209.6185 crore which is 8.77% of construction cost and 6th year renewal cost of Rs. 695.1465 crore which is 29% of construction cost. State was asked to reexamine the 6th year renewal cost which seems to be on higher side as compared to cost in other States. State was 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.

15. New Technology Proposals

- i. State has not proposed waste plastic in 70% of the eligible length involving Hot Mix. State has informed that due to ban on plastic use in the State, the required waste plastic material is not easily available.
- ii. State has proposed 1404 km length out of 1892.77 km length using MSS (Mixed Seal Surfacing) of 25 mm.
- iii. State has proposed Cold Mix Technology only for 7.28% (184.76 km) of the eligible proposed length (2536.77 km). State should propose 25% of the total eligible proposed length using Cold Mix Technology as per New Technology Vision 2022.
- iv. State has proposed 145.19 km length using Paneled Cement Concrete and 12.67 km length using CC Block technology. **State should propose 100% eligible length under Panelled Cement Concrete/ Cell Filled Concrete** and which needs to be corrected on OMMAS.
- v. State has proposed 644 km length with Full-Depth Reclamation (FDR) technology and 499 km under Cement Treated Base (CTB). EC has advised that FDR should be used to bring down the cost and it should be applied in proper place. NRIDA should examine this in detail.
- vi. During Pre-EC meeting, it was observed that in most of the proposals 30mm Bituminous Concrete (BC) has been proposed, the extra cost due to this should be added in the higher specifications, to be borne by the state. **State apprised the EC that the BC and FDR (as per IRC code) technology has been proposed in the snow bound area having heavy snow fall which needs to be further examined by the NRIDA. The road proposals in all other areas have been proposed with topping as mix seal surfacing of 25MM thickness.**

16. Progress of PMGSY Works

Annual physical target of the State during 2023-24 is 1790 km road length and connecting of 53 habitations, out of which, only 54 km length has been completed and only 2 habitations have been connected.

The details of work sanctioned, completed, pending and unawarded under PMGSY-I, II and III 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	3466	20603.34	3303	19628.842	163	660.928	0	0.00
PMGSY II	112	1251.16	95	1175.655	17	69.815	0	0.00
PMGSY III	45	440.18	0	0.00	45	440.183	1	9.590
Total:	3623	22294.68	3398	20804.497	225	1170.926	1	9.590

LSBs

Scheme	Sanction (Nos.)	Completed (Nos.)	Balance (Nos.)	Un-awarded (Nos.)
PMGSY I	103	93	10	0
PMGSY II	1	1	0	0
PMGSY III	0	0	0	0
Total:	104	94	10	0

Out of the total works sanctioned under PMGSY-I, II & III, 1 road of 9.590 km length remain un-awarded which needs to be awarded at the earliest. During the meeting, it was reiterated that State needs to put more efforts, so that the pending works of PMGSY-I & II are completed at the earliest.

17. Maintenance of roads under DLP

During 2021-22, against the liability of Rs. 35.74 crore, expenditure of Rs. 19.37 crore has been done. For the financial year 2022-23, the maintenance liability was Rs. 61.38 crore and the expenditure has been done only Rs. 26.30 crore. **EC observed that very less expenditure has been incurred on maintenance corresponding to their maintenance liability. State should put more efforts on maintenance to improve the quality of the roads. During 2023-24, against the liability of Rs. 68.88 crore, expenditure is only to the tune of Rs. 6.31 crore.**

State has not updated on OMMAS any amount credited in SRRDA's account during 2021-22 to 2023-24. Therefore, State was asked to intimate/update the fund released to SRRDA under DLP during the above-mentioned period.

During 2023-24, State has done renewal of 43.76 km length of roads against 4100 km due for renewal during the year. State was requested to increase the pace of renewal and update the figures on OMMAS.

18. e-Marg

Out of total 1035 packages pushed to e-MARG, 86 packages are pending for locking, 122 packages are pending for manual entry expenditure (MEE). 447 roads are eligible for routine inspection in May, 2023, 34 roads (7.61%) are pending for routine inspection (RI) missed in May, 2023. 178 packages are pending for payment for >3 months. 61 packages

are pending for payment for first payment for > 3 months. Expenditure of Rs.7.59 core has been done using e-MARG in FY 2023-24. Total expenditure of Rs. 1.71 crore has been done on bills having liability of FY 2023-24. The above position was found to be unsatisfactory. The State should take necessary steps to increase DLP expenditure on roads due for maintenance. There should be visible progress on e-Marg.

19. Award analysis

Out of total 41 awarded works under PMGSY-III, 03 works have been awarded at 18-24% below sanctioned cost, 12 works at 12-18% below sanctioned cost, 06 works at 6-12% below sanctioned cost, 08 works at 0-6% below the sanctioned cost and 12 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.

20. Quality

(a) Out of 232 ongoing packages, QC lab has not been established in 01 package. State was requested to look into it.

(b) It was observed that 04 works had not been inspected by SQMs even once. The State was requested to conduct the inspection on these works at the earliest.

(c) Against the target of 561 SQM inspections in the current FY 2023-24, only 108 inspections have been conducted so far. State was requested to conduct the remaining inspections.

(d) 50 ATRs (15 completed works + 35 ongoing works) are pending at State Level. Out of which, 24 ATRs are pending for more than 2 years. State should show substantial compliance for these pending ATRs.

(e) 06 complaints are pending at State level during the financial year 2020-21 and 2021-22 which is required to be resolved at the earliest.

(f) Unsatisfactory grading by NQM from **June, 2020 to May, 2023** for completed works is **9.79%** and for ongoing works it is **7.52%**. The unsatisfactory grading by NQM from **June, 2022 to May, 2023** for completed works is **28.95%** and for ongoing works, it is **11.67%**. Thus, the unsatisfactory quality grading awarded by the NQM **from June, 2022 to May, 2023** is high for ongoing works and completed works when compared to grading awarded by the NQM **from June, 2020 to May, 2023**.

Similarly, unsatisfactory grading by SQM from **June, 2020 to May, 2023** for completed works is **1.96%**, for ongoing works it is **2.84%** and for maintenance works, it is **17.08%**.

The unsatisfactory grading by SQM from **June, 2022 to May, 2023** for completed works is **3.15%**, for ongoing works, it is **4.31%** and for maintenance works, it is **19.90%**. Thus, the unsatisfactory quality grading awarded by the SQM **from June, 2022 to May, 2023** is high for all type of works when compared to grading awarded by the SQM from **June, 2020 to May, 2023**.

EC has observed that the quality of PMGSY works, as brought out in the reports of by NQMs and SQMs, has declined in recent years. State needs to put more attention on ensuring quality of ongoing works, completed works and also towards maintenance works.

(g) Out of 187 QCR of ongoing works, State has uploaded only 132 QCRs. State should upload balance QCRs of ongoing works immediately.

The State was asked to review the performance of active SQMs on priority and take action against the defaulting SQMs. State was advised to take immediate corrective action and show some improvement in the aforesaid issues.

21. SQM Analysis

(a) It was also observed 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 is satisfactory.

(b) Inspections done by SQMs need to be compared with the inspections done by NQMs road-wise.

(c) It has also been observed that more inspections have been done by the SQM who has graded most of roads as satisfactory and fewer inspections have been done by the SQMs who has graded some roads as unsatisfactory. The SQMs namely Shri B.B. Bhardwaj, Shri NK Gupta, Shri Ram Swaroop Kalia and Shri Sudhir Mittal have not graded any road as 'unsatisfactory' or have graded very few roads as 'unsatisfactory'. This aspect also needs to be checked at State level, and their performance to be evaluated. Performance evaluation should be done of these SQMs and they should be deployed only after this evaluation after the approval of the CEO.

22. Financial issues

- a. Interest of Rs. 7.07 crore is pending for recovery from Bank.
- b. State has not submitted interest verification exercise for period of FY 2004-05 to 2009-10 & 2021-22.
- c. Financial closure of 103 works is pending for more than 180 days as on 09.06.2023. 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.

23. Subject to the above observations and concurrent action/compliance by the State Government as stipulated in the foregoing paras, the Empowered Committee recommended the above road proposals (except LSB proposals) as mentioned at para -2 above.

Meeting ended with vote of thanks to and from the chair.
