

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

**Government of India  
Ministry of Rural Development  
Department of Rural Development**

Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi

Dated the 04<sup>th</sup> May, 2023

**MINUTES**

**Sub: Minutes of Meeting of Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the State Government of Kerala for the 2023-24(Batch-I) -reg.**

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Empowered Committee held on 20<sup>th</sup> April, 2023 through VC to consider the project proposals for Batch-I of 2023-24 under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action.



(Lalit Kumar)

Deputy Secretary to the Government of India

Tele. No. 011- 23382406

Email:-lalit.kr@nic.in

**Distribution:**

1. The Principal Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government of Kerala, Secretariat, Thiruvananthapuram -695001.
2. The Chief Engineer, 5th Floor, Swaraj Bhavan, Nanthancode, Kowdiar P O Thiruvananthapuram 695003, Kerala.
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. All Directors in National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), 15 NBCC Tower, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi.

Copy for information to:-

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

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 20<sup>TH</sup> APRIL, 2023 TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY THE STATE OF KERALA UNDER PMGSY-III, (BATCH-I, 2023-24)**

A Meeting of the Empowered Committee was held through Video Conferencing on 20<sup>th</sup> April, 2023 under the chairmanship of the Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of India to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Kerala under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) (Batch-I) of 2023-24. Following officials were present in the meeting:-

<b>Government of India Representatives</b>	
Shri Shailesh Kumar Singh	Secretary, Department of Rural Development
Dr Ashish Kumar Goel	Additional Secretary (RD)& DG, NRIDA
Ms. Tanuja Thakur Khalkho	Joint Secretary & FA, DoRD
Shri Amit Shukla	Joint Secretary (RC), DoRD
Shri. B C Pradhan	Consultant/Director (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Nirmal Bhagat	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agrawal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
Shri Lalit Kumar	Deputy Secretary, MoRD
Shri Anand Kapur	Assistant Director (P.III), NRIDA
<b>State Government Representatives</b>	
Dr. Sharmila Mary Joseph	Principal Secretary, LSGD
Shri Sandeep K G	Chief Engineer, LID&EW
Shri Anil Kumar. R.S	Chief Engineer, KSRRDA
Shri Bijoy Varghese	Empowered Officer
Smt. Lekha C S	Superintending Engineer

**2. Details of Proposal**

Item	As per Pre-EC dated 15.02.2023				As per OMMAS dated 18.04.2023			
	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)
<b>Roads</b>	99	519.36	506.46	97.51	112	594.75	554.45	93.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>99 roads</b>	<b>519.36 Km roads</b>	<b>506.46</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>112 roads</b>	<b>594.75 Km roads</b>	<b>554.45*</b>	

**\*MoRD Share: Rs. 328.45 crore**

**State Share : Rs. 226 crore**

- The State of Kerala has been allocated a target of 1,425 km under PMGSY-III. The State has already been sanctioned 686.23 Km and 738.77 km remains to be sanctioned. The current batch of proposals submitted by the State



includes 112 roads of 594.75 km worth Rs. 554.45 crore at an average cost of Rs. 93.22 lakh/Km.

- ii. All the proposals uploaded on OMMAS are scrutinized by STA. Scrutiny of 10 proposals have been carried out by PTA.
- iii. The State has proposed 108 roads of 569.34 Km in 3.75 m carriageway width at an average cost of Rs 91.56 lakh/km and 4 roads of length 25.40 Km in 5.50 m carriageway width at an average cost of Rs. 130.35 lakh/km.
- iv. The average cost of the roads of 3.75 m carriageway width was Rs. 95.63 lakh/Km, which has come down to Rs. 91.56 lakh/Km. Similarly, the average cost of 5.50 m carriageway width has come down from Rs. 144.66 lakh/km to Rs. 130.35 lakh/Km.

The increase in the average cost of roads and bridges when compared to previous batch of 2020-21 are mainly due to increase in the rate of GST and revision in SoR.

### 3. Planning

#### (i) Trace Map Cut- Quality of roads

Trace Map rank	Number of proposals	%
1 to 15	61	54
16 to 50	34	30
51 to 100	11	10
>100	6	5
Total	<b>112</b>	-

**The Committee was informed that the State Government has submitted justifications in respect of 17 roads with Trace Map Rank more than 50, which have been examined on Geosadak and found in order.**

#### (ii) Planning Audit (proposals)

- All 112 road Proposals are uploaded on GEOSADAK.
- 114 road proposals were audited for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III. Two (02) unsatisfactory proposals have been removed by the State from the current batch.
- During scrutiny, 3 roads were found to be having Non-BT surface more than 25%. However, the factual position, which transpired during the discussion in EC meeting are as under:-
  - i. **Package No. KR03126 (MRL16-Vimalagiri Anjanipady Ambalapady Pandipara Road):** It was found that there is a mistake in data

uploading with regard to existing surface. The total CC + BT length is 3.767 Km, which is about 78.2% of total proposed length. It was also observed that the proposed road have lower altitude and more convenient for the huge public to access MDR. The Committee decided to include the proposal in the current batch. The State was asked to update the data on OMMAS.

- ii. **Package No. KR247 ( MRL04- Pareekanni Mangattupady Stadium Uppukulam Chirameldpady Paimattam Mulamarichira Road) :** After excluding 3<sup>rd</sup> stretch of road which is having a length of 797 metre and which is not serving to any major habitation or facilities and also creating a terminating link, which is not allowed under PMGSY-III, the total road length would be 3.689 Km and % of BT surface will be 18.90%. Hence, the proposal can be taken up.
- iii. **Package No. KR03105 ( MRL17-Venmani Pallikkude Pattekudi Meenuliyan IHDP Panchali Varickamuthan):** The road has 42% Non-BT/CC surface. As per the State Government, the above road is the 2<sup>nd</sup> eligible road in the CUCPL of Elamdesam Block. The road starts from a State Highway and it is very essential for Tribals to reach to Markets for selling their Agro Products. Meenuliyam is Tourist place too. It was also informed that the instant road is an Inter-block road. Considering the importance of the road, the Committee agreed to the proposal as an exception.

#### 4. Existing surface details

The approximate length (in km) of the existing Surface of the roads proposed in the current batch, as intimated by the State representative during the meeting is as under:-

Brick soling	Track	Gravel	Moorum	WBM	BT	CC	Total
0	4.27	5.52	7.55	1.70	562.34	13.37	594.75

Out of 112 roads proposed in the current batch, in 97 roads 95-100% of the existing surface is BT/CC. In 5 road works the percentage of BT/CC is 85-95% and for 7 roads the portion of BT/CC is 75-85% and the remaining 3 roads are having 50-75% portion as BT/CC.

#### 5. High Priority Roads Skipped in CUCPL

With regard to 577 road works of High Priority which have been skipped, State has furnished the following justifications:

- i. 290 roads have been skipped due to land issues,
- ii. 91 road works have been as the ownership of the said road works are with different department,



- iii. 67 roads have been sanctioned under State Scheme and are under construction
- iv. In case of 46 roads, proposable road length is less than 5 Km.
- v. 33 roads are under State Scheme DLP
- vi. In case of 29 road works State is not interested in Riding Surface Improvement
- vii. 10 road works are under PMGSY DLP
- viii. In case of 7 road works eligible length already proposed in PMGSY-III, and
- ix. 3 roads due to forest issues.

**The State was asked to submit road-wise justification in respect of 91 roads, which have been skipped on the ground that the ownership of road is with different department. The State was also asked to indicate if these are being taken up by other departments for upgradation.**

#### **6. Traffic wise details of road**

- (i) In 3.75 m carriage width , 21 roads of length 93.26 km are in T4 category with average pavement cost of Rs. 57.23 lakh/km and average cost of Rs. 85.31 lakh/km.
- (ii) In 3.75 m carriage width, 5 roads of length 23.82 km are in T5 traffic category with average pavement cost of Rs. 61.12 lakh/ km and average cost of Rs. 97.57 lakh/km.
- (iii) In 3.75 m carriageway width, 78 roads of length 427.59 km are in T6 traffic category with average pavement cost of Rs. 60.23 lakh/km and average cost of Rs 92.26 lakh/Km.
- (iv) In 3.75 m carriageway width, 4 roads of length 24.66 km are in T7 traffic category with average pavement cost of Rs. 65.08 lakh/km and average cost of Rs 97.46 lakh/Km.
- (v) In 5.50 m carriageway width, 1 road of length 5.50 km is in T6 traffic category with average pavement cost of Rs. 91.25 lakh/km and average cost of Rs 140.75 lakh/Km.
- (vi) In 5.50 m carriageway width, 2 roads of length 13.30 km are in T7 traffic category with average pavement cost of Rs. 95.13 lakh/km and average cost of Rs 105.95 lakh/Km.
- (vii) 1 road of 6.60 Km is in IRC 37 traffic category with average pavement cost of Rs. 132.71 lakh/km and average cost of Rs 170.87 lakh/Km.

**The Committee was informed that the State had earlier proposed 96 roads of 499.96 Km in 3.75 m carriageway width at an average cost of Rs. 95.63**

lakh/Km and 3 roads of length 19.90 Km in 5.50 m carriageway width at an average cost of Rs. 144.66 lakh/Km. The proposal was subsequently modified by the State as per the observations of the Central Team and as a result the average cost of aforesaid roads in 3.75 m carriageway width has come down to Rs. 90.931 lakh/Km and that in 5.50 m carriageway width to Rs. 128.22 lakh/Km.

**7. Pavement cost/km wise details**

The pavement cost of 112 roads proposed in the current batch is as under:-

Sl No	Pavement cost/km	No of roads	
		3.75 m	5.5
1	<50 Lakhs	8	-
2	50-55	13	-
3	55-60	29	-
4	60-65	34	-
5	65-70	21	-
6	70-75	3	-
7	85-90	-	1
8	>100	-	3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>4</b>

**8. Non-Pavement cost/km wise details**

The Non-pavement cost of 112 roads proposed in the current batch is as under:-

Sl No	Non Pavement cost/km	No of roads	
		3.75 m	5.5 m
1	<30 Lakhs/km	53	2
2	30-40	36	1
3	40-50	11	1
4	50-60	6	-
5	60-70	1	-
6	70-80	1	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>4</b>

**9. PCU value**

The PCU of 112 roads proposed in the current batch are as under:-

S.No	PCU/day	No of Roads	No of Roads
		3.75 m	5.5 m
1.	<500	41	-
2.	500-1000	42	-



3.	1000-1500	19	-
4.	1500-2000	04	02
5.	2000-2500	00	01
6.	3000-5000	-	01
9.	>5000	02	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>108</b>	<b>04</b>

10. **Distribution of roads based on Widening to various Carriageways**

<b>Categories of Upgradation</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Length (km)</b>	<b>Avg. Pavement Cost (Lakhs /KM)</b>	<b>Avg. Total Cost (Lakhs /KM)</b>
3.00-3.75	78	431.17	59.98	93.78
3.75-3.75	30	138.18	59.99	84.68
3.75-5.50	2	15.90	112.78	135.56
5.5-5.5	2	9.50	89.45	121.64
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>594.75</b>	<b>61.87</b>	<b>93.22</b>

As for 78 roads proposed for widening from 3.00 to 3.75 m, the State was advised that the same shall be done with due videography. The geo-tagged videography shall be uploaded on OMMAS and will also be preserved so that it can be seen during SQM and NQM inspections.

11. **R&D Proposals**

- State has proposed 276.26 Km under FDR (Cement stabilization).
- 100% Waste Plastic Technology should be adopted in cases bituminous surfacing course is executed using hot bitumen.
- The State was advised to adopt cement treated base in roads, where pavement cost is very high.
- In case of cement concrete pavement, 100% length should be executed adopting paneled cement concrete/cell filled concrete.

12. **Maintenance**

State has proposed Rs. 4,832.17 lakh for 5 years Routine maintenance, which is 8.71% of the construction cost and agreeable. Similarly, for 6<sup>th</sup> year renewal cost is Rs. 8792.36 lakh, which is 15.85% of the construction cost and agreeable.

### 13. Status of implementation of PMGSY-I, II and III

The status of implementation of PMGSY-I, II & III is as under:

#### Roads

Scheme	Sanctioned		Completed		Balance		Unawarded	
	Nos.	Length (Km)	Nos.	Length (Km)	No. of Roads	Length (km)	No. of Road	Length (km)
<b>PMGSY-I</b>	1,374	3,308.373	1,358	3,232.737	16	48.253	0.00	0.00
<b>PMGSY-II</b>	149	582.888	138	552.675	11	25.210	3	13.001
<b>PMGSY III</b>	143	686.232	9	125.484	134	558.222	14	63.766
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,666</b>	<b>4,577.493</b>	<b>1,505</b>	<b>3,910.90</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>631.69</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>76.767</b>

#### Bridges

S.No	SCHEME	Sanction (Nos.)	Completed (Nos.)	Balance (Nos.)	Unawarded (Nos.)
1	PMGSY I	1	1	0	0
2	PMGSY II	3	1	2	0
3	PMGSY III	0	0	0	0
<b>Total:</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

The State was asked to expedite dropping/foreclosure proposals under PMGSY-I. As for 3 unawarded roads under PMGSY-II, the State representative indicated that these projects are to be dropped. The State was asked to submit dropping proposals.

As for unawarded projects under PMGSY-III, the State representative intimated that these are non-responsive despite 3 times tendering. These projects were sanctioned as per SoR 2016 and that the State Government permits escalation upto 10% over and above extant SoR. The State representative was asked to get the issue resolved in consultation with the State Government and award these works on priority.

### 14. Physical progress

The State could construct only 128 Km during FY 2022-23, against the target of 500 Km.

### 15. Maintenance of roads under Defect Liability Period (DLP)

The Committee observed that there was Zero expenditure on 24% roads under DLP during FY 2022-23. It was also observed that the funds received status and expenditure on DLP roads are not updated on OMMAS. The State was asked to do so on priority and ensure maintenance all the roads under DLP.



## **16. Renewal Length Status**

**The Committee observed that the status are not being updated on OMMAS. The State representative informed that the Renewal is being done by the other wing and assured that the status shall be updated on OMMAS on priority.**

## **17. e-Marg**

Under eMARG, 6 (2%) packages pending for locking, 8 (3%) packages are pending for MEE. Out of total 90 roads eligible for Routine Inspection during March, 2023, 4 roads (4%) missed Routine Inspection during March, 2023. 39 packages are pending for payment for more than 3 months (out of packages on which MEE done) and total 6 packages pending for first payment in eMARG. The Committee observed that that out of total expenditure of Rs. 5.70 crore incurred during the current year, only Rs. 0.43 crore has been incurred on bills having liability of FY 2022-23. The State was advised to saturate progress on e-Marg and ensure maintenance of all roads under DLP.

## **18. PMGSY-III Award analysis**

Out of the awarded 129 works, 67 works are awarded below sanction amount and 62 works are awarded above sanctioned amount. 23 works have been awarded 0-6% below, 24 works 6-12% below, 16 works 12-18% below, 3 works 18-24% below, and 1 work 30% below the Technical Sanctioned amount. The Director (P.III) was asked to carry out band-wise analysis of quality inspections done by the NQMs and SQMs. 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 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2022 issued by NRIDA.

## **19. Quality Control**

**I.** 145 packages are presently in progress and lab for 1 package is not established. The State representative assured that the Lab shall be established during this month only.

**II.** 2 works of 6-12 months and 3 works of more than 12 months have not been inspected by SQM even once. The State was asked to get these works inspected on priority.

**III.** The target for SQM inspections during 2022-23 was 780 against which only 426 inspections were carried out.

### **IV. Unsatisfactory % based on NQM inspections (April, 2020 - March, 2023)**

- Completed Works - 5.88 % - 17 Completed works inspected

- Ongoing Works - 3.31% - 121 Ongoing works inspected
- Maintenance works - 0.00% - 2 Maintenance Works Inspected

**Attention of State was invited towards high U% in completed works and the State was asked to take corrective measures.**

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

- Total - 11 ( Ongoing works-10, Completed works-01)

**The State was asked to look into the pendency and furnish Action Taken Report on priority.**

**VI. Two (02) complaints are pending at State level. The State was asked to expedite ATR.**

**20. QCR Analysis Report**

QCR has not been uploaded in respect of 27 ongoing works. The State was asked to expedite the same.

**21. SQM Analysis :**

It was noticed during the meeting that some SQMs empanelled by the State have graded very zero or 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. **The State was asked to not to assign any new work to SQM at Sl. No. 14,1 and, 19 until their performance is evaluated.**

**22. Financial Issues**

- Non- Submission of Audited Balance Sheet of all the three funds for FY 2021-22. **The State assured submission within a week.**
- Internal Audit is not conducted by the State. **The State representative intimated that the process of selection is ongoing.**
- Interest calculated and submitted by State is not as per the Tripartite agreement. The State needs to submit revised calculation.
- Incomplete & incorrect Reconciliation format submitted by the State.
- Un-reconciled Balance Standing in Audited Balance sheet of programme fund.



- Recovery of excess payment made to contractors and roads were still incomplete after many years ( Audit Report of FY 2019-20, Package No. KR07-08 & KR07-09)

**23.** The Empowered Committee recommended the proposal as per para-2 above for clearance.

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

\*\*\*\*